My Battle

(Mein Kampf)

By
ADOLF HITLER

Translated by

E. T. S. DUGDALE

AUTHORIZED EDITION WITH THE CONSENT OF VERLAG FRZ. EHER NACHF G.M.B.H.

MÜNCHEN, GERMANY

CONTENTS

PART I

PART II

IMPORTANT DATES IN HITLER'S CAREER

April 20	1889	Born in Braunau Austria. Father an Austrian patriot, mother a Bohemian from Prague. Childhood spent in Lambach, Austria.
	1903	Goes to Vienna at age of 14. Employed as a builder's helper.
	1912	Leaves Vienna for Munich. Works as a carpenter, architect's draughtsman, and painter in water-colors.
August 3,	1914	Enlists as private in German army.
	1916	Serves on the Somme. Made Lance Corporal and is awarded Iron Cross.
October 7,	1916	Wounded and ordered home.
October 14,	1918	Is gassed and temporarily blinded
	1919	Discharged from hospital and returns to Munich. Enters politics by joining German Workers' Party.
February 24,	1920	Makes début as an orator at the first mass meeting of the Party.
	1920	Adopts Swastika as Party emblem
	1921	Changes name of Party to National Socialist, organizes Storm Troops.
November 8,	1923	Proclaims National-Socialist revolution. Hitler Putsch fails, and Party is dissolved.
November 12,	1923	Arrested
February,	1924	Brought to trial.
April 1,	1924	Imprisoned in fortress at Landsberg am Lech and begins writing *Mein Kampf*.
December,	1924	Released from prison
February 27,	1925	Resumes leadership of National Socialist Party.
June 27,	1926	Second meeting of the Party.
February 11,	1927	Riot with Communists
July 4,	1927	Starts Party newspaper, *Der Angriff*.
August 21,	1927	Third meeting of Party.
May,	1928	Nazis obtain 12 seats in Reichstag.
September 14,	1930	Election of Fifth Reichstag. Nazis increase seats from 12 to 107, with popular vote of 6,275,000.
March 15,	1931	Parades, mass meetings, speeches, etc., declared illegal by Von Hindenburg.

February,	1932	Takes oath of allegiance to Reich and becomes candidate for President.
April 10,	1932	Hindenburg re-elected.
April 24,	1932	Wins plurality in five German States, including Prussia
August 13,	1932	Declines Vice-Chancellorship
November 22,	1932	Refuses Chancellorship on Von Hindenburg's conditions.
January 30,	1933	Appointed Chancellor
June,	1934	Meeting with Mussolini at Venice
June 30,	1934	'Blood purge'
August 2,	1934	Death of Von Hindenburg. Offices of President and Chancellor united in person of Hitler
March 1,	1935	Saar restored to Germany
March,	1936	Remilitarization of Rhineland
November 25,	1936	Nazi-Japanese Alliance

MY BATTLE

PART I

I

MY HOME

It stands me in good stead today that fate decided that Braunau on the Inn should be my birthplace. That little town lies on the frontier between two German States, the reunion of which we younger ones regard as a work worthy of accomplishment by all means in our power.

German Austria will have to return to the great German Motherland, but not for economic reasons. No, no! Even if reunion, looked at from that point of view, were a matter of indifference, nay, even if it were actually injurious, it would still have to come. Common blood should belong to a common Reich. The German people have no right to dabble in a colonial policy as long as they are unable to gather their own sons into a common State. Not till the confines of the Reich include every single German and are not certain of being able to nourish him can there be a moral right for Germany to acquire territory abroad whilst her people are in need. The plough will then be the sword, and the coming world's daily bread will be watered by the tears of war. Thus it comes about that the little frontier town is to me the symbol of a great enterprise.

Are we not the same as all other Germans? Do we not all belong together? This problem began to seethe in my childish brain. In answer to my shy questions I was obliged with secret envy to accept the fact that all Germans were not so fortunate as to be members of Bismarck's Empire.

I did not want to become an official. Neither 'talking to' nor 'serious' argument made any difference to my reluctance. I did not want to be an official and refused to be one. Any attempt, by quoting my father's example, to arouse love or keenness for that calling only had the contrary effect. I hated and was bored by the idea of having to sit tied to an office, of not being master of my own time filling up forms.

Now, when I review the effect on myself of all those years, I see two facts which stand out most conspicuously: (1) I became Nationalist, and (2) I learned to grasp and understand history in its true sense.

The old Austria was a State of nationalities.

In comparatively early youth I had an opportunity of taking part in a struggle of nationality in the old Austria. We assembled for the South Mark and the school society and expressed our sentiments with cornflowers and the black-red-gold colors, and there was cheering, and we sang *Deutschland über Alles* in preference to the Austrian *Kaiserlied*, in spite of warnings and punishments. Thus the youth were being educated politically at an age when a member of a so-called national State usually knows little about his nationality except its language.

Even then I obviously could not be counted amongst the lukewarm. I soon became a fanatical German Nationalist—not, however, the same thing as conceived by our party today.

This development progressed very rapidly in me, so that by the time I was fifteen I had understood the difference between dynastic 'patriotism' and popular 'nationalism'; I knew far more about the latter.

Did not we boys already know that this Austrian State had and could have no love for us Germans?

Our historical knowledge of the methods of the House of Habsburg was corroborated by what we saw every day. in the North and the South the poison of the foreign races ate into the body of our nationality, and even Vienna was visibly becoming less and less a German city. The Royal House were becoming Czech in every possible way; and it was the hand of the goddess of eternal justice and inexorable retribution that caused the most deadly enemy of Germanism in Austria, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, to fall by the very bullets which he had himself helped to mould. And he was the chief patron of the movement, working form above to make Austria a Slav State!

The germ of the future World War, and indeed of the general collapse, lay in the disastrous connection of the young German Empire with the Austrian shadow State.

In the course of this book, I shall have to deal exhaustively this problem. It is enough to state here that from my earliest youth I was convinced that Austria's destruction was a necessary condition for the security of the German race; and, moreover, that the feeling of nationality is in no way identical with dynastic patriotism; also that the House of Habsburg was set upon doing harm to the German race.

Even then, I perceived the deductions from this realization: intense love for my German-Austrian home and deep hatred against the Austrian State.

The choice of profession had to be decided on quicker than I had expected. Poverty and stern reality forced me to make a rapid decision. My family's small means were nearly exhausted by my mother's severe illness; the pension, which came to me as an orphan, was not enough to live on, so that I was forced to earn my living somehow myself.

With a valise full of clothes and linen, I went off to Vienna full of determination. I hoped to ward off fate, as my father had succeeded in doing fifty years before. I wanted to become something—but in any case not an official.

II

MY STUDIES AND STRUGGLES IN VIENNA

IN VIENNA, amazing riches and degrading poverty were mixed together in violent contrast. In the central parts of the city one felt the pulse of the Empire with its fifty-two millions, with all the dangerous charm of that State with many nationalities. The dazzling brilliancy of the Court attracted the wealth and intelligence of the rest of the Empire like a magnet, to which was added the strong centralizing policy of the Habsburg Monarchy. This offered the only possibility of holding that hash of nations together. The result was an extraordinary concentration of all authority in the capital.

Moreover, Vienna was not only politically and intellectually the centre of the old Danube Monarchy, but it was also the centre of administration. Besides the host of high officers, State Officials, artists and professors, there was a still greater host of workers and crushing poverty existed side by side with the wealth of the aristocracy and merchant class. Thousands of unemployed hung about the palaces on the Ringstrasse, and below that *via triumphalis* those who had no homes crowded in the dinginess and filth of the canals.

Social questions could hardly be studied in any German town better than in Vienna. But let there be no mistake. This studying cannot be done from above. No one who is not caught up in the coils of this poisonous snake can get to know its poison fangs; outsiders are either different or they exhibit nothing but superficial chatter and false sentimentality. I do not know which is more desolating: the ignorance of social needs on the part of those who have been lucky and those who have risen by their own efforts or the supercilious and intrusively tactless, though always kindly, condescension of certain fashionable ladies with gowns and pantaloons, who are by way of sympathizing with the people. These latter certainly error more from lack of instinct than they can possibly understand. Thus they are astonished to find that the results of their readiness for social work are always nil and often produce violent antagonism; it is held up as a proof of the people's ingratitude. Such minds refuse to understand that social work is beside the point, and above all that they must not look for gratitude, since it is not a question of distributing favors, but of restoring rights.

I perceived even then that in this case a twofold method was the only way to improve matters, namely, a deep feeling of social responsibility for creating better principles for our development, combined with ruthless determination to destroy excrescences, which could not be remedied.

Just as nature concentrates, not on maintaining what exists, but on cultivating new growth in order to carry on the species, so in human life we may not exalt the existing evil, which, owing to the nature of man, is impossible in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, but rather assure better methods for future development from the start.

During my struggle for existence in Vienna, I perceived clearly that the social task may never consist of welfare work, which is both ridiculous and useless, but rather in removing the deep-seated mistakes in the organization of our economic and cultural life which are bound to end in degradation of the individual.

Since the Austrian State practically ignored social legislation altogether, its inability to abolish evil excrescences loomed large before one's eyes.

I do not know what most appalled me at that period —the economic misery of our fellow-workers, their moral crudity, or the low level of their spiritual development.

Does our bourgeoisie not often rise in moral indignation when it learns from the mouth of some wretched tramp that he does not care whether he is a German or not, that is all the same to him so long as he has enough to keep him alive? They at once protest loudly at such want of 'national pride' and their horror at such sentiments finds strong expression.

But how many really ask themselves why they themselves have a better sentiment? How many understand the many reminders of the greatness of their fatherland, their nation, in all domains of cultural and artistic life, which combine to give them legitimate pride in being members of a nation so highly favored? How many of them are aware how greatly pride in the Fatherland depends on knowledge of its greatness in all these domains?

I then learned to understand quickly and completely something which I had never been aware of before: The question of 'nationalizing' a people is first and foremost one of creating healthy social conditions as a foundation for the possibility of educating the individual. For only when a man has learned through education and schooling to know the cultural, economic, and above all the political, greatness of his own Fatherland can he and will he gain that inner pride in being permitted to be a member of such a nation. I can fight only for what I love, love only what I respect, and respect only what I at any rate know about.

Now that my interest in social questions was awakened, I began to study them thoroughly. A new and unknown world revealed itself to me.

In the years 1909-10, I had so far improved my condition as not to have to earn my daily bread as an assistant worker. I was working independently as a draughtsman and painter in watercolors.

The *psyche* of the mass of the people is not receptive of anything savouring of half-measures and weakness. Like a woman whose sensibilities are influenced less by abstract reasoning than by indefinable longing and a respect for superior strength, and who would rather bow to the strong man than dominate the weakling, the people love a stern ruler more than a suppliant and feel more inwardly satisfied by doctrines which suffer no rival than by an admission of liberal freedom, which they have very little idea how to use. They are as little conscious of the shame of being spiritually terrorized as of an abuse of their

freedom as human beings, calculated to drive them to revolt; nor are they aware of any intrinsic wrongness in their position. They only see the ruthless strength and brutality of their ruler's determined utterances to which they always bow in the end.

If a doctrine, superior in truth, but ruthless in practice, is set up against Social Democracy, that doctrine will win, however severe the struggle.

Before two years had passed, the doctrine of Social Democracy became clear to me, as also its use as a technical instrument.

Since Social Democracy well knows the value of strength from its own experience, it usually attacks those in whom it scents something of that element, which is, moreover, so rare. On the other hand, it extols any weakling on the opposing side, at first cautiously, then more boldly, according as his qualities are recognized or imagined. It fears a powerless, purposeless nature less than a strong will, even though its mentality may be different.

It knows how to make people believe that it alone has the secret of peace and tranquility, while it cautiously but unflinchingly conquers one position after another, either by silent pressure or by downright robbery at moments when public attention is directed to other matters, or when the affair seems too paltry to call public interference.

These are tactics calculated absolutely on the sum of human weakness, and their result is a mathematical certainty unless the other side also learns how to fight poison gas with poison gas.

Weak natures have to be told that it is a case of 'to be or not to be.' Intimidation in workshops and factories, at meetings and mass demonstrations, is always accompanied by success so long as it is not met by an equally powerful force of intimidation.

Poverty, which overtook the workers sooner or later drove them into the camp of Social Democracy. Since on countless occasions the bourgeoisie, not only most stupidly but most immorally, made common cause against the most legitimate of human demands, often without getting or expecting profit for themselves thereby, workmen, even the most disciplined, were driven out of the trades-union organization into politics.

By the time I was twenty years old, I had learned to distinguish between the trades union as an instrument for defending the social rights of the employee and for fighting for better living conditions for him and the union as a party instrument in the political class war.

The fact that Social Democracy realized the immense importance of the trades-union movement gave it the instrument and assured its success; the bourgeoisie failed to realize it and so lost their political position. They thought that contemptuous refusal to let it develop logically would give it its quietus and would really force it into illogical paths. For it is absurd and also untrue to claim that the

trades-union movement is essentially hostile to the Fatherland; the opposite is the more correct view. If trades-union action aims at improving the condition of a class which is one of the pillars of the nation and succeeds in doing so, its action is not against the Fatherland or the State, but is 'national' in the truest sense of the word. In that way it helps to forge social principles, without which general national education is unthinkable. It earns the highest merit, for, by eradicating social cankers, it attacks causes of disease both mentally and bodily and also adds to the general welfare of the nation.

As far as essentials are concerned, the question is really a superfluous one. So long as there are among employers men with little social understanding or wrong idea of justice and fairness, it is not only the right but the duty of their employees, who after all form a part of our population, to protect the interests of the whole against the greed or unreasonableness of the individual; for to keep loyalty and faith alive in the mass of the people is to the nation's interests, just as much as keeping them healthy.

If unsocial or unworthy treatment of men provokes resistance, then, until the lawful judicial authorities are prepared to do away with the evil, this struggle can only be decided by the side which is strongest. It is evident, moreover, that any large group of employees, face to face with an individual employer, supported by the concentrated strength of his business, must unite in a single body if they are not to give up all hope of victory from the very start.

In the course of a few decades, under the expert hand of Social Democracy, the trades-union movement grew from being the means for protecting the social rights of man into an instrument for laying national economics in ruins. The interests of the workers were not going to count at all with the promoters of this object. For in politics the use of economic pressure always permits extortion whenever one side is sufficiently unscrupulous and the other has sufficient stupid, sheepish, patience.

By the beginning of this century, the trades-union movement had long ceased to serve its earlier purpose. With each succeeding year, it fell more and more under the influence of Social Democratic politics and ended by being used merely as the battering ram for the class war.

Instead of opposing this by taking the offensive, the bourgeoisie submitted to being pressed and harried, and ended by adopting utterly inadequate measures, which being taken too late were ineffective and were easily repulsed owing to their weakness. So all really remained as it was, but the discontent was more serious than before.

The 'free trades union' lowered over the political horizon and over each man's life like a threatening storm cloud. It was one of the most terrible instruments of intimidation against security and national independence, the solidity of the State and individual freedom. It was, above all, that which turned the idea of

Democracy into a repellent and derisory phrase, brought shame to liberty and mocked at brotherhood in the words: 'If you won't join us, we will crack your skull for you.'

I learned then something about this 'friend of man.' As years went on, my opinions widened and deepened, but I never found reason to alter them.

As I obtained more insight into the externals of Social Democracy, my longing increased to understand the inner kernel of its doctrines. The official literature of the party was nearly useless for my purpose. When dealing with economic questions its assertions and arguments are incorrect, and as regards the political aim they are fallacious. Hence, I felt intensely repelled by the modern petti-fogging methods of expression and writing.

Finally, I learned the connection between this doctrine of destruction and the character of a race, which until then was almost unknown to me.

Understanding of the Jews is the only key to comprehension of the inner, and therefore real, aims of Social Democracy. To comprehend that race is to raise the veil of false conceptions regarding the objects and meaning of this party, and to reveal the nonsense of Marxism as it rises grimacing out of the fog and mist of social phrases.

It is difficult, if not impossible, today for me to say when the word 'Jew' first began to suggest special ideas to me. I have no recollection of having heard the word at home during my father's lifetime. If the old gentleman mentioned the term in any special way, I think it would have been in reference to an antiquated culture. His views during his life were more or less those of a citizen of the world, and were combined in him with a strong feeling of nationality, which had its effect on me as well.

In school, too, I found no reason leading me to alter the picture I had received at home. At the *Realschule* I got to know a Jewish boy whom we all treated with much consideration; but, having learned something by various experiences with regard to his reticence, we did not particularly trust him.

It was not till I was fourteen or fifteen years old that I frequently met the word 'Jew,' partly in connection with political talk. I then took a slight dislike to it, and could not escape an uncomfortable feeling, which came over me when religious differences were discussed in my presence.

At that time, I saw the question in no other aspect. Linz possessed very few Jews. Throughout the centuries, they had become European in externals and like other people; in fact I looked on them as Germans. The wrongness of this conception was not clear to me, since the only distinguishing mark I saw in them was their unfamiliar religion. As I thought they were persecuted on that account, my aversion to remarks in their disfavor almost grew into abhorrence. Of the existence of deliberate Jewish hostility, I had no conception.
Then I arrived in Vienna.

Being confused by the mass of architectural impressions and crushed by the hardness of my own lot, I was at first unaware of the stratifications of the people within that immense city. Although Vienna then counted something like two hundred thousand Jews among its population of two millions, I failed to see them. During the first weeks, my eyes and mind were unable to take in the rush of values and ideas. Not till I gradually became calmer and the confused images began to get clearer did I obtain a deeper view of this new world and come up against the Jewish question.

I will not say that the way in which I was to make acquaintance with them was very pleasant to me. I still saw Jewry as a religion, and therefore for reasons of human tolerance I still disliked attacking them on religious grounds. Thus, I considered the tone adopted by the ant-Semitic press in Vienna unworthy of the cultural traditions of a great nation. I was oppressed by the memory of certain events in the Middle Ages which I would not care to see repeated. Since the newspapers in question had not a high reputation in general – how this came about I never knew then exactly – I regarded them more as the product of jealous rage than the result of a genuine, if wrong-headed opinion.

My own opinions were fortified by what seemed to me the infinitely more dignified forms in which the really great press replied to those attacks or silently ignored them altogether—which occurred to me as being even more worthy of respect.

I read the so-called world-press diligently (*Neue Freie Presse, Wiener Tageblatt,* etc.), but I was constantly repelled by the unworthy way in which these papers curried favor with the Court. Scarcely any event at the Hofburg failed to be reported in tones of enchanted enthusiasm and given screaming publicity, a foolish practice, which, even if it had to do with the 'wisest Monarch' of all time, was almost equal to the behaviour of an *Auerhahn* (capercailzie) when mating. I considered it a blemish on Liberal Democracy.

In Vienna, I continued as before to follow all events in Germany with fiery enthusiasm, whether they concerned political or cultural questions. With proud admiration, I compared the rise of the Empire with the decadence of the Austrian State. But if the events of foreign policy caused me solid pleasure on the whole, I was often distressed by the political life at home, which was not so satisfactory. The campaign against William II did not meet with my approval. I regarded him not only as the German Emperor, but above all as the creator of the German navy. The fact that the Reichstag forbade the Emperor to make speeches, therefore, infuriated me, because the prohibition came from a quarter, which, in my eyes, was entirely incompetent. During a single sitting those parliamentary ganders put together more nonsensical chatter than a whole dynasty of emperors, even the weakest of them, could do during centuries.

It enraged me that in a State, in which any fool could claim the right to criticize and was actually let loose on the nation as a 'lawgiver' in the Reichstag, the wearer of the Imperial Crown could be reprimanded by the most insipid and absurd institution of all time.

I was even more disgusted that the Vienna press, which bowed respectfully before the lowest of the low if he belonged to the Court, now, with a pretense of anxiety, but, as I saw it, with hardly disguised hostility, gave expression to its objections to the German Emperor.

I was obliged to admit that one of the anti-Semitic papers, the *Deutsch Volksblatt*, behaved with more decency in connection with the same subject.

The nauseating manner in which the more influential press toadied to France was also on my nerves. One had to be ashamed to be a German when observing those dulcet hymns in praise of the 'great culture-nation.' The wretched pandering to France more than once made me throw down those 'world-journals.' I would then turn to the *Volksblatt*, which seemed to me to take a somewhat cleaner, if smaller, view of these matters. I did not agree with its sharply anti-Semitic tone, but I now and again read in it arguments which caused me some reflection.

In any case I learned slowly from such suggestions about the man and the movement which then decided the fate of Vienna: Dr. Karl Lueger and the Christian Socialist Party. When I arrived in Vienna, I was hostile to both. In my eyes, the man and the movement were 'reactionary.'

Once when I was walking through the inner city, I suddenly came across a being in a long caftan with black side-locks. My first thought was: Is that a Jew? In Linz, they did not look like that. I watched the man stealthily and cautiously, but the longer I stared at that strange countenance and studied it feature by feature, the more the question in a different form turned in my brain: Is that a German?

As always on such occasions, I proceeded to try to remove my doubts by means of books. For the first time in my life I bought some anti-Semitic pamphlets for a few heller. Unfortunately, these assumed that the reader had at least some knowledge or understanding of the Jewish question. Finally, the tone of most of them was such that I again fell into doubt, because the assertions in them were supported by such flimsy and unscientific arguments.

The subject appeared so vast and the study of it so endless that, tortured by the fear of doing an injustice, I again became anxious and unsure of myself.

I could not well continue to doubt that here it was a matter, not of Germans of another religion, but of a separate nation; for, as soon as I began to study the question and to take notice of the Jews, Vienna appeared to me in another light. Now, wherever I went, I saw Jews, and the more I saw, the more strikingly and obviously were they different from other people. The inner city and the parts north of the Danube Canal especially swarmed with a population, which bore no similarity to the Germans.

But, though I might still have doubts, my hesitations were dispelled by the attitude of a section of the Jews themselves. A great movement arose among

them, which was widely represented in Vienna, in favor of asserting the national character of Judaism; this was Zionism. It certainly looked as if only a section of the Jews would approve of this attitude, and that a large majority would condemn, in fact, frankly reject, the principle. On nearer observation, however, this appearance resolved itself into an evil mist of theories, produced purely for reasons of expediency—lies, in fact. For the so-called Liberal Jews disowned the Zionists, not being as non-Jews, but simply as Jews of a creed, which was unpractical, nay, perhaps even dangerous, for their own Judaism.

But there was no alteration in their solidarity. The seeming discord between Zionists and Liberal Jews quickly sickened me; it seemed ungenuine through and through, and all a lie; and, moreover, unworthy of the ever-vaunted moral elevation and purity of that nation.

Judaism suffered a heavy setback in my eyes when I got to know of its activities in the press, in art, literature, and the drama. Unctuous protestations were no good anymore now. One only had to look at their posters and study the names of the inspired creators of those hideous inventions for the cinema and the theatre that one saw commended on them, in order to become permanently hardened. It was pestilence, spiritual pestilence, worse than the Black Death, with which the nation was being inoculated.

I began to study carefully the names of all the creators of these unclean products of the artistic life as given to the people. The result was increasingly damaging to the attitude I had taken up hitherto in regard to the Jews. Though my feelings might rise against it a thousand times, my reason had to draw its own conclusions.

Then I began to examine my favorite 'world press' from the same point of view. I saw the Liberal tendencies of that press in another light; its dignified tone in replying to attacks, its complete ignoring of them, were now revealed to me as a cunning, mean trick; their brilliantly written theatrical critiques always favored Jewish authors, and their adverse criticism was given to Germans alone. Their light pin-pricks against William II showed the consistency of their methods, as did also their commendation of French culture and civilization. The general sense was so clearly to depreciate everything German that it could only be intentional.

Now that I realized the Jews as the leaders of Social Democracy scales, as it were, began to fall from my eyes. My long mental struggle was at an end.

I gradually realized that the Social-Democratic press was preponderantly controlled by the Jews. I attached no particular importance to this circumstance by itself, but it was exactly the same with the other newspapers. But there was one striking fact: there was not a single paper with which Jews were connected which could be described as genuinely national in the sense that my education and opinions had taught me.

I got over my reluctance and tried to read this sort of Marxian stuff in the press, but my dislike of it intensified as I read; I now tried to get acquainted with the compilers of that mass of knavery; from the editors downwards they were all Jews.

I seized all the Social-Democratic pamphlets I could get hold of and looked up the names of their authors – nothing but Jews. I noted the names of nearly all the leaders: the great majority belonged to the 'chosen people'; whether they were members of the Reichsrat or secretaries of trade unions, chairmen of organizations or street agitators, the same sinister picture was presented. The names of Austerlitz, David, Adler, Ellenbogen, and so on, will ever remain in my memory.

One thing now became clear to me; the leadership of the party with whose minor supporters I had been fighting hard for months was almost entirely in the hands of a foreign race; for to my inward satisfaction I knew finally that the Jew was no German.

It was only now that I thoroughly understood the corrupter of our nation.

The more I contended with the Jews, the more I learned to know their dialectical methods. They began by relying on the stupidity of their opponents, and if that was unsuccessful, they themselves would pretend stupidity. If that was no good, they would refuse to take in what was said or promptly leap to another subject, and they came out with truisms, which, when agreed to, they made to refer to something quite different; then, once again on their own ground, they would weaken and pretend to have no precise knowledge. Wherever one attacked such apostles, one's hand met foul slime. If one smote on of them so crushingly that, with the bystanders looking on, he had no course but to agree, and if one thought one had gained at least one step, he merely showed great astonishment the next day. The Jew entirely forgot what had been said the day before and repeated his shameful old story as if nothing had happened, pretended anger and amazement and forgetfulness of everything except that the debate had proven the truth of his assertions.

I was often left staring. One did not know which to admire most – their glibness or their artfulness in lying. I gradually began to hate them.
All this had one good side. In the sphere in which the carriers or at least the propagators of Social Democracy came under my eye, my love for my own nation inevitably increased.

Under the inducement of my everyday experience, I now began to seek the sources of the Marxian doctrine. Its workings were clear to me in individual instances; my observant eye daily marked its successes, and with a little imagination, I was able to figure out the consequences of it. The only remaining

question was whether its founders enjoyed the results of their creation, as seen in its most recent form, or whether they themselves were the victims of an error.

Thus, I began to make myself acquainted with the founders of the doctrine in order to study the principles of the movement. The fact that I achieved my object quicker than I dared to hope at first was thanks to the knowledge I had gained of the Jewish question, though at that time it had not gone very deep. Nothing but that made possible to me a practical comparison of its realities with the theoretic claims of the first apostles of Social Democracy, since it had taught me to understand the verbal methods of the Jewish people, whose aim it is to hide or at least to cloak their ideas; their real objective is not to be read between the lines, but is tucked away well concealed between them.

It was at this time that the greatest change took place in me that I was ever to experience. From being a feeble world-citizen, I became a fanatical anti-Semite.

During my study of the influence of the Jewish nation throughout long periods of human history, the gloomy question suddenly occurred to me whether possibly inscrutable Destiny, for reasons unknown to us poor mortals, had not decreed the final victory of that little nation.

The Jewish doctrine of Marxism rejects the aristocratic principle in Nature, and in place of the eternal privilege of force and strength sets up the mass and dead weight of numbers. It thus denies the value of the individual among men, combats the importance of nationality and race, thereby depriving humanity of the whole meaning of its existence and culture. It would, therefore, as a principle of the universe, conduce to an end of all order conceivable to mankind. And as in that great discernible organism nothing but chaos could result from the application of such a law, so on this earth would ruin be the only result for its inhabitants.

If the Jew, with the help of his Marxian creed, conquers the nations of this world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of the human race, and the planet will drive through the ether once again empty of mankind, as it did millions of years ago.

Eternal Nature takes inexorable revenge on any usurpation of her realm.

Thus did I now believe that I must act in the sense of the Almighty Creator; by defending myself against the Jews, I am fighting for the Lord's work.

III

POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS RESULTING FROM MY TIME IN VIENNA

Political thought in general was greater and more comprehensive in range in the Old Danube Monarchy than in Germany itself during the same period—with the exception of Prussia, Hamburg, and the North Sea Coast. By 'Austria' I mean for this purpose that part of the great Habsburg Empire, which, as a result of being settled by Germans, exhibited in every respect not only the historical forces in the formation of that State, but also, in its population, those capable of supplying that creation, politically so artificial, with its inner cultural life in the course of many centuries. As time advanced, the life and destiny of that State depended more and more on keeping alive this seed-cell of the Empire.

The fact that the collection of races called 'Austria' was finally destroyed does not in the least imply political incompetence in the Germany of the old *Ostmark*, but it was the inevitable result of the impossibility of maintaining permanently a State of fifty millions consisting of different races, with the help of ten millions, unless absolutely definite principles were established in good time.

The German-Austrian was always used to living within the bounds of the great Empire, and had never lost the feeling of the duties, which this involved. In that State he alone, when looking beyond the frontier of the narrower Crown land, saw still the frontiers of the Empire. Though indeed it was his fate to be separated from the common Fatherland, he ever sought to master the immense task and to keep for Germany what his ancestors had once wrested from the East in their age-long struggles. And it should not be forgotten that this was still possible with divided strength, for in heart and memory the best men never ceased to be in sympathy with the common mother country– and yet but a shred of their homeland remained theirs.

The circle of vision of the German-Austrian was wider than that of the rest of the Empire. His economic relations frequently embraced almost the whole of the composite Empire. Almost all really large enterprises were in his hands. He supplied most of the leading technical experts and officials. Moreover, he carried on the trade abroad, in so far as the Jews had not laid hands on that domain which had been his of old time. The German-Austrian recruit might perhaps enter a German regiment, but that regiment might be as likely to be stationed in Herzegovina as in Vienna or Galicia. The corps of officers continued to be German, the higher officials preponderantly so. Art and science were German. Leaving out the more recent artistic developments, which might simply be the production of a Negro race, the possessor and diffuser of true artistic ideas was the German, and the German only. In music, architecture, sculpture, and painting, Vienna was the source that supplied the whole Dual Monarchy in an inexhaustible stream, with no appearance of ever drying up.

Finally, the whole burden of foreign policy was borne by Germans, although a few Hungarians may be included in the number.

Yet, any attempt to maintain this Empire was in vain, since the essentials were absent.

In the Austrian Empire of races, there was only one possible way of conquering the centrifugal tendencies of individual nations: the State must be governed from the centre and organized internally to that end.

In occasional lucid intervals, the Emperor perceived this, but it was soon forgotten or shelved as being too difficult to carry out.

In Germany, it was merely a question of overcoming political tradition, since the country had always been united in a common cultural root and the population of the Reich was made up of the members of one single race. In Austria, the contrary was the case. In the various countries, apart from Hungary, there were no memories of a great past, or perhaps the passing of time had extinguished them; at any rate, they were dim and blurred. But, in their place popular forces developed in those countries, all the harder to circumvent at a time when national States began to be formed on the edges of the Monarchy, the peoples of which, being racially related or identical with nationalities in Austria, were in a position to exert more attraction than German Austria possibly could.

Even Vienna failed to stand up in this struggle.

In Buda-Pest, which had developed into a capital city, Vienna was for the first time faced by a rival whose task it was not so much to weld the whole Monarchy together as to strengthen one part of it.

Soon Prague was to follow Buda-Pest's example, then Lemberg, Laibach, and other centres.

Ever since the death of Joseph II (1790) the course of this process could be clearly traced, Its speed depended on a number of factors, which lay partly in the Monarchy itself, but were in other respects the result of the Empire's political position at various times towards foreign countries.

If the struggle to maintain this State was to be taken up seriously and fought to a finish, ruthless and consistent centralization alone could attain the object. But, homogeneity in form must be expressed by establishment in principle of a unified State language and the technical instrument for this had to be forced into the hands of the administration, for without it a unified State could not endure. The only way, moreover, of producing uniform and permanent State consciousness was through the schools and education. It could not be achieved in ten or twenty years, but one had to think in centuries, for, as in all questions of colonization, steadfastness of purpose is of greater importance than spasmodic effort.

The Austrian Empire was not composed of similar races and was held together not by common blood, but rather by a common fist. This being so, weakness in the leadership would lot lead necessarily to torpor in the State, but would arouse

all the individualist instincts, due to race, which are deterred from developing in times when there is a will predominating.

Failure to comprehend this is perhaps the tragic crime of the House of Habsburg.

At one period Fate held her torch once more high over the land; then it was extinguished forever, Joseph II, Roman Emperor over the German nation, realized with poignant anxiety how his House was being thrust into the uttermost corner of the Empire and was bound to founder in the vortex of a Babylon of races, unless the shortcomings of his predecessors were made good at the eleventh hour. That 'friend of man' set out with superhuman energy to repair the neglect of previous rulers and tried to recover in ten years what had been let slip for centuries. His successors were unequal to the task either in mind or will-power.

The Revolution of 1848 should have been a struggle of classes everywhere, but in Austria, it was the commencement of a fresh struggle of nationalities. But the German, either forgetting or not realizing that fact, placed himself at the service of the revolutionary movement, and he sealed his own fate by doing so doing. He played his part in arousing the spirit of world democracy, which in short time robbed him of the principles underlying his own existence.

The formation of a representative parliamentary body, without previous establishment of the principle of a common State language, laid the foundation stone of the end of the predominance of the German race; and from that moment the State itself was bound for destruction. What then followed was the historical reduction of an Empire.

I have no wish to wander off into details, since that is not the object of this book. I wish merely to assemble for the purpose of closer consideration those events which, being always constant, as the causes of decadence in nations and states, possess significance for our epoch, and which helped finally to settle the principles of my political thought.

Among the institutions which might have indicated to the ordinary citizen, even if not blesses with sharp eyes, that the Monarchy was disintegrating, the chief was that one which ought to have chosen strength as its essential quality–Parliament, or, as it was called in Austria, the Reichsrat.

It is manifest that the Parliament of England, the land of 'classic' democracy, was the parent of that body. That blessed institution was transplanted thence in its entirety and established in Vienna with as little alteration as possible.

The English two-chamber system inaugurated its new life in the *Abgeordnetenhaus* and *Herrenhaus*. But the Houses themselves were somewhat different. When Barry's Houses of Parliament sprang, as it were, from the waters of the Thames, he drew from the history of the British world Empire inspiration for the ornamentation for the twelve hundred niches, brackets, and pillars of his magnificent edifice. Thus with their sculptures and paintings the Houses of the Lords and Commons became the temple of the nation's glory.

Here was Vienna's first difficulty. For when the Dane, Hansen, had completed the last pinnacle of the marble palace for the people's representatives, his only course was to try to ornament it with subjects derived from the antique. Greek and Roman statesmen and philosophers embellish that theatrical edifice of 'Western Democracy,' and with symbolic irony the quadrigæ on the top of the building are driving away from each other towards the four quarters of the heavens, thus perfectly symbolizing the divergent tendencies inside. The nationalities would have taken it as an insult and a provocation, if Austrian history had been glorified in that work, just as in the German Empire it was not until the thunder of battle was heard in the World War that they dared consecrate Paul Wallot's Reichstag building in Berlin with an inscription 'To the German People.'

The destiny of the German race in the Austrian State was dependent on their strength in the Reichsrat. Up to the time when universal suffrage and the secret ballot were introduced, there was still a German majority in Parliament. But the situation was rendered intolerable by the unreliable behaviour of the Social Democrats who always came forward in opposition to the German interest in critical questions affecting the German race – in order to avoid estranging its adherents among the various foreign races. Even then, the Social Democrats could not be regarded as a German party. After universal suffrage was brought in, the German superiority ceased even as a numerical majority. There was nothing now in the way of further de-Germanization of the State.

The desire for national self-preservation, therefore, led me to feel but little enthusiasm for popular representation, in which the German race was always being betrayed instead of being represented. Moreover, these were evils which, like so many others, were attributable not to the thing itself, but to the Austrian State. In the early days, I still thought that, if the German majority were restored in the representative bodies, there would be no occasion to go on with my opposition on principle, so long as the old State continued to exist.
It took but little time to arouse my indignation when I saw the miserable comedy that was being unfolded before my eyes.

Democracy in the West today is the forerunner of Marxism, which would be inconceivable without Democracy. It is the feeding-ground of that world-pestilence which is enabled to develop there. It its outward form of expression – the parliamentary system – it appeared as 'a monstrosity of filth and fire' (*eine Spottgeburt aus Dreck und Feuer*), in which, to my regret, the fire seemed to have burnt itself out only too quickly.

I am more than grateful to Fortune for putting this question before me in Vienna for examination, since I fear that in Germany I could not then have so easily answered the question. If I had learned to know the absurdity of that institution, called Parliament, for the first time in Berlin, I might perhaps have fallen into the opposite extreme, and with no apparent good reason have ranged myself with those, in whose eyes the good of the people and the Empire lay in exalting the Imperial idea, and who thus set themselves blindly in opposition to mankind and the times.

In Austria that was impossible. It was not so easy there to slip from one mistake into another. If Parliament was worth nothing, the Habsburgers were worth still less.

Parliament decides upon something; be the consequences ever so devastating, no single man is responsible; no one can be called to account for it. For can it be called taking responsibility for a Government which has done all the harm merely to retire from office? Or for the coalition to be changed, or even for Parliament to dissolve? For how can a varying majority of men ever be held responsible at all? Is not every conception of responsibility closely connected with personality? But can one in practice indict the leading personage in a Government for dealings, the existence and carrying out of which are to be set down solely to the account of the will and pleasure of a large assemblage of men?

Is the leading statesman's task to consist not so much in producing a creative thought or plan as in the art with which he makes the genius of his proposal comprehensible to a flock of silly sheep for the purpose of imploring their final consent? Must it be the criterion of a statesman that he be as strong in the art of persuasion as in statesmanlike skill I the selection of great lines of conduct or decision?

Do we believe that progress comes in the world from the combined intelligence of the majority and not from the brain of an individual? Or do we imagine that in future we can dispense with this conception of human culture? Does it not, on the contrary, appear even more necessary today than ever before?

By its denial of the authority of the individual and its substitution of the sum of the mass present at any given time, the parliamentary principle of the consent of the majority errors against the basic aristocratic principle in nature, in which connection its view of the higher classes need in no way be bound up with the present-day decadence of our upper Ten Thousand.

It is difficult for a reader of Jewish newspapers to imagine the evils involved in this modern institution of democratic control by Parliament, unless he has learned to think and examine for himself. It has been the primal cause why all our political life has been so unbelievably flooded with all that is most worthless. So long as the true leaders are withdrawn from political activities, which consist chiefly, not in creative work and production, but in haggling and bargaining for the favors of a majority, so long will these activities be in harmony with low mentalities, and will also be an attraction to them.

One thing we must and may never forget: a majority can never be a substitute for a the Man. It is always the advocate, not only of stupid, but also of cowardly policies; and just as a hundred fools do not make one wise man, an heroic decision is not likely to come from a hundred cowards.

The result of it all is the terrific speed of the changes in the most important positions and offices in such a state, a fact which is unfavorable in any case and which frequently works with absolutely catastrophic effects; for not only the stupid

and inefficient fall victims to these methods of procedure, but the true leaders even more so, if and whenever Fate manages to set such a character in that position.

So the result will ever increasingly be a spiritual impoverishment of the leading classes. Anyone may judge what the result will be for the nation and the State.

Our ordinary conception of the expression 'public opinion' depends only in a very small measure on our own personal experiences or knowledge, but mainly, on the other hand, on what we are told; and this is presented to us in the form of so-called 'enlightenment' persistently and emphatically. The political vision of the mass perceives the final result only of what has frequently been a tough and searching struggle of the soul and intellect.

Far the most effective share in the political 'education,' which in this case is very appropriately named 'propaganda,' is that which falls to the press, which takes on itself the 'work of enlightenment' and thus sets up a kind of school for grown-ups, as it were. This instruction is, however, not in the hands of the State, but is gripped by forces for the most part very inferior in character. As a young man in Vienna, I had the best of opportunities for getting knowledge of the owners and clever craftsman of that machine for mass education. At the start, I could but wonder at the short time it had taken for that evil power in the State successfully to create a definite public opinion, in spite of the fact that it might involve a deceitful reversal of the public's real desires and views. In a few days this absurdity became a State act of great consequence, while at the same time essential problems fell into great oblivion, or rather they were stolen away from the memory and attention of the masses.

Thus, in the course of a few weeks names were successfully conjured up out of nothing, and incredible hopes were connected with them in the public mind; they were given a popularity which a really great man could never hope to attain in the whole course of his life – names which a month before no one had even heard of; whereas old and trusted characters in public and State life died in the height of their efficiency as far as their contemporaries were concerned, or were overwhelmed with such abuse that their names seemed likely soon to become symbols of infamy. It is necessary to study this shameful Jewish method of simultaneously and from hundreds of directions, as if by an incantation, pouring filth in the shape of slander and defamation on the clean garb of honorable men, in order to estimate the full menace of these scoundrels in the press at its right value.

We shall most quickly and easily grasp that senseless and dangerous human aberration if we compare the democratic parliamentary system with true German Democracy.

The point most remarkable in the first is that a number – say five hundred – of men are elected, who are called upon to decide on every kind of issue. In practice, therefore, they and they only are the Government; for if a cabinet is selected from their number, which, as far as the country is concerned,

undertakes to control the business of the State, it is really only a pretense. The so-called Government can, as a matter of fact, take no action without first obtaining the consent of the general assemblage. It cannot, however, be made responsible for anything, since the final decision is never in its hands, but in those of the parliamentary majority. It exists merely to execute the will of the majority in all cases.

It is not the aim of our present day Democracy to form an assemblage of wise men, but rather to collect together a crowd of subservient nonentities who can easily be led in certain definite directions, especially if the intelligence in each individual of them is limited. Only thus can the game of party politics be played in its unhealthy present-day sense. But, it also makes it possible for the real wire-pullers to remain safely in the background, with no possibility of ever being made personally responsible. For now, a decision, however harmful to the nation, cannot be put to the account of any one rascal who is in the public eye, whereas, it can always be transferred to the shoulders of a whole section.

Thus, there is no responsibility in practice, for this liability can rest on one individual only, and not on an assemblage of parliamentary chatter-boxes. That institution can only be pleasing or profitable to mendacious crawlers who avoid the light of day, and it must be hateful to any good, straightforward man who is ready to take personal responsibility. Hence, this style of Democracy has become the instrument of the race, which, in order to forward its own aims, has to avoid the sunlight now and in all future time. None but a Jew can value an institution that is as dirty and false as he is himself.

In contradistinction to the foregoing is the true Germanic Democracy with the free choice of the Leader, along with his obligation to assume entire responsibility for all he does and cause to be done. This includes no majority vote on individual questions, but simply the decision of one man who backs it with his life and all that he has. For anyone who objects, that, such being the requirements, it would hardly be possible to find anyone ready to devote his person to tasks so risky, there can be but one answer: 'God be thanked, the whole point of a German Democracy is that any stray unworthy climber and moral shirker cannot come in by the backstairs and govern his fellow-countrymen, but, that incompetents and weaklings will be scared by the immensity of the responsibility to be assumed.'

The parliamentary regime in the later years continuously contributed towards progressive weakening of the old Habsburg State. As the predominance of the German element was broken up by its agency, a system grew up of playing off the nationalities one against the other. But, the general line of development was directed against the Germans. In particular, from the time when his heirship to the throne began to give the Archduke Francis Ferdinand a certain influence, a deliberate scheme arose for increasing Czech influence, which was the policy of those at the top. The future ruler of the Dual Monarchy tried by every means in his power to give impetus to the de-Germanizing process and to assist it himself,

or at least favor it with his protection. Thus purely German villages were, by round about official means, slowly but surely thrust into the danger zone of mixed languages. In Lower Austria itself the process was making more and more rapid progress, and many of the Czechs considered Vienna as their chief city.

The preponderant thought of this new Habsburger, whose family spoke Czech from choice (the Archduke's wife had been a Czech countess and had married the Prince morganatically, and the circles in which she was born were anti-German by tradition), was gradually to establish a Slav State in Central Europe, on strictly Catholic lines, to be a protection against Orthodox Russia. In this way, as so frequently happened with the Habsburgers, religion was once again dragged in to serve a purely political conception – moreover, a baneful one, when looked at from the German point of view.

The result was more than tragic in several respects. Neither the House of Habsburg nor the Catholic Church profited by it as they had hoped.

Habsburg lost the Throne, Rome a great State.

For by summoning religious forces to serve its political ends, the Crown aroused a spirit, which at the start it clearly thought to be an impossible one. The attempt to stamp out Germanism in the old Monarchy, by every possible means, was answered by the Pan-German movement in Austria.

After the Great War the House of Habsburg slowly but, deliberately set to work with its last spark of determination to root out the dangerous German race – for this was surely the aim of Slavophil policy – and revolt flamed up in the nation, which was determined to resist to the end, in a way unknown in the more recent history of Germany.

For the first time men of national and patriotic feeling turned into rebels – rebels not against the State in itself, but against a system of government which, they were convinced, was bound to end by destroying its character as a nation.

For the first time in later German history, a distinction arose between ordinary dynastic patriotism and national love for the Fatherland and People.

It should not be forgotten that, as a general rule, it is not the highest aim of man's existence to maintain a State or government, but rather to conserve its national character.

Human rights are above State rights. If, in its struggle for human rights, a race goes under, it means that it has weight too light in the scales of Fate to be fit to continue to exist in this terrestrial world. For if a man is unprepared or unable to fight for his life, just Providence has already decreed his end.

The world is not for craven-hearted races.

Everything connected with the rise and the passing of the pan-German movement on the one hand, and the astounding advance of the Christian-Socialist Party on the other, were to be of the deepest consequence to me as objects of study.

I shall start my examination with the two men who may be regarded as the founders and leaders of the two movements: Georg von Shoenerer and Dr. Karl Lueger.

Considered as men they tower, both of them, far above the average of parliamentary personalities. In that slough of universal political corruption their whole lives remained clean and incorruptible. And yet my personal sympathies lay at first on the side of the Pa-German Schoenerer, but, they gradually attached themselves to the Christian-Socialist leader as well.

When I compared their capabilities, Schoenerer appeared to me better and more solid thinker on the basic problems. He visualized the enforced end of the Austrian State more clearly and correctly than anyone else. If his warnings regarding the Habsburg Monarchy had been listened to, particularly in the Empire, the disaster of Germany's world war against the whole of Europe would never have happened.

But, though Schoenerer realized the inwardness of the problems, he was mistaken as regards the human element. This was Lueger's strong point. He had a rare knowledge of men, and he especially avoided the error of visualizing men as better than they were. Thus, he took better account of the real possibilities of life, whereas Schoenerer had but little understanding to communicate his theoretic knowledge to the public, and to present it in such a form as to fit in with the capability of the mass of the people for absorbing it – for that is, and always will be, limited. Therefore, all his knowledge was but wisdom of a seer, with never a possibility of becoming a practical reality.

Unfortunately, he had a most imperfect perception of the extraordinary limitations of the bourgeoisie's readiness to fight, due to their situation in business, which individuals are too much afraid of losing, and which therefore deters them from action.

This lack of understanding of the significance of the lower strata of society was the cause of the utter inadequacy of his views on the social question.

In all Dr. Lueger was the opposite of Schoenerer. He understood only too perfectly that the fighting strength of the higher bourgeoisie is small nowadays and insufficient to win a victory for a great new movement. He was prepared to make us of all available means of power, to attract to himself strong existing institutions, so as to derive the greatest possible profit for his movement from such old-established sources of power.

Lueger based his new party first of all on the middle class which was threatened with extinction, and thus secured a class of adherents extremely hard to shake, ready both for great sacrifices and capable of stubborn fighting. His extreme cleverness in maintaining relations with the Catholic Church soon won over the younger clergy. In fact, the old Clerical Party was forced to retire from the field, or else they more sensibly joined the new party in the hope of gradually regaining their position.

The aims that this truly outstanding man set before himself were intensely practical. He wished to capture Vienna, the heart of the Monarchy. From that city the final vestiges of life filtered into the sickly, worn-out body of the decaying Empire. If the heart were sound, the rest of the body was bound to revive – an idea correct in principle, but, the period for turning it into action was finite and limited.

Herein lay the man's weakness. His achievements as burgomaster of the city are immortal in the best sense of the word; but even so, he could not save the Monarchy. It was too late.

His rival, Schoenerer, saw this more clearly.

What Dr. Lueger took practically in hand succeeded wonderfully; what he hoped for as a result of it came to nothing.

Schoenerer failed to carry out his desire; his fears were realized, alas! In a terrible fashion.

Thus neither of them attained his further objective. Lueger could not save Austria, and Schoenerer could not guard the German race against ruin.

It is most instructive for us today, to study the causes of the failures of both these parties. For it is essential, since in many points, conditions today are similar to those of that time, and it may help us to avoid making the mistakes which led to the death of the movement and the barrenness of the other.

The fate, which overtook the Pan-German movement, was due to the fact that it did not at the start attach supreme importance to gaining adherents among the great mass of the people. It grew bourgeois and respectable, but underneath it was radical.

The German position in Austria was already desperate by the time of the rise of Pan-Germanism. With each succeeding year Parliament was acquiescing more and more in a policy of gradual extinction of the German race. The only hope for any belated attempt to save it lay in the removal of that institution; there was, however, but little prospect of this.

The Pan-Germans went into Parliament and came out beaten. The forum in which the Pan-Germans put their case had grown, not greater, but more insignificant; for men only speak to the circles which are there to listen to them, or which receive their words through reports in the press.

But the greatest forum and the most direct as regards the listeners is not the Parliament chamber, but a large public meeting. For thousands of people are present who have come simply to hear what the speaker has to say to them, whereas in the Parliament chamber, only a few hundred are present, and most of them merely attend for the purpose of receiving their payment as members and not to receive enlightenment from the wisdom of one or other of the 'peoples Representatives'.

Speaking before such a forum really is casting pearls before swine. Truly, it is not worth the trouble! No sort of success is possible. And that was what

happened. The Pan-German members grew hoarse with speaking – but they carried no weight whatever. The press either ignored them entirely or so mutilated their speeches that any consecutives –often the sense even – was twisted round or lost altogether, and the public received by a very bad picture of the aims of the new movement. What individual members said was not important; the importance lay in what those who read them received. This consisted of mere snippets out of their speeches, which, being mutilated, merely could – and were meant to – produce a senseless impression. Thus the only forum, before which they really spoke, consisted of a paltry five hundred men, and that tells us enough.

Worse was to follow.

The Pan-German movement could only hope for success if it realized from the very first moment that it was not a question of forming a new party, but rather a new view of life in general. This alone could call up the inner forces to fight that immense struggle to a finish. For that purpose, none but the very best and boldest brains are any good.

If the fight for a world system is not conducted by heroes, ready to sacrifice all, in a short time it will be impossible to find fighters prepared to die. A man who fights only for himself cannot have much left over for the general cause.

The hard struggle that the Pan-German movement had with the Catholic Church is only explicable as being due to the lack of understanding of the psychological character of the people.

The appointment of Czech incumbents to parishes was one of the many methods used to transform Austria generally into a Slav country. It was done somewhat as follows: Czech clergy were introduced in to purely German parishes and these soon began to superimpose the interests of the Czech race upon those of the Church, and they became nuclei of the de-Germanizing process.

The German clergy collapsed almost entirely, alas! Before this state of affairs, not only were they themselves quite useless in a fight for the German cause, but, they were unable to meet the attacks of the other side with sufficient force of resistance. Thus the German race was slowly but irresistibly driven back by the abuse of religion on the one side and weakness in defense on the other.

Georg Schoenerer was not one who did things by halves. He took up the struggle with the Church under the conviction that this struggle alone could rescue the German race. The *Los von Rom* movement appeared a most powerful, though most difficult, form of attack, but it was bound to lay the hostile castle in ruins. If it succeeded, the unhappy religious division in Germany would be settled forever, and such a victory would prove an immense gain to the internal strength of the Empire and the German nation. But, its assumptions and its reasoning with regard to the struggle were both incorrect.

There is no doubt that the national power of resistance of the Catholic priesthood of German nationality in all questions affecting the German race was

inferior to that of their non-German brethren, especially the Czechs; whereas, the Czech clergy treated their own race subjectively; and the Church merely objectively, the German priest's devotion to the Church was subjective and it was objective regards the German race.

Compare the attitude that our official class, for instance, is adopting towards a movement for a national rebirth with that which would be adopted by the official class of any other nation under similar circumstances. Or do we imagine that the corps of officers anywhere else in the world would dismiss national demands with the phrase 'State authority.' As happened with us five years ago? It was held up as being perfectly natural, nay, highly meritorious!

In the course of my study of the Pan-German movement and it's struggle with Rome, then and later, I arrived at the following conclusion: Through its poor comprehension of the meaning of the social problem, the movement lost the fighting strength of the mass of the people; by going into Parliament, it lost it's driving force and burdened itself with all the weaknesses inherent in that institution. Its struggle against the Church discredited it with many sections of the lower and middle classes and robbed it of very many of the best elements, which could be named as being essentially national.

The practical results of the *Kulturkampf* in Austria were just nil.

Political parties ought to have nothing to do with religious problems, so long as they are not undermining the morals of the race; in the same way, religion should not be mixed up with party intrigues.

If Church dignitaries make use of religious institutions and even doctrines in order to injure their own nationality, they ought to have no following; their own weapons should not be used against them.

A political leader must never meddle with the religious doctrines and institutions of his people, else he ought not to be a politician, but, rather a reformer, if he has the qualities for that!

Any other attitude would lead to catastrophe, especially in Germany.

Protestantism will always help in furthering all that is German whenever it is a matter of inward purity or increasing national sentiment, or defense of German life, language, nay, even German freedom, since all these are essentially a part of itself; but it is most hostile to any attempt to rescue the nation from the clutches of its most deadly enemy, for its attitude towards Judaism has been laid down more or less as a dogma. Nevertheless it wavers undecidedly around the question – and unless that question is solved, all attempts to bring a German revival are without meaning or possibility of success.

Do not both our creeds today assume an attitude with regard to the Jewish question that is in harmony neither with the nation's importance nor with the requirements of religion? And yet compare the attitude of any Jewish rabbi in all questions of even minor importance to Jewry as a race with that of our clergy, far

the greater number of whom have been suspended – both creeds included! That is what always happens with us if ever it is a matter of defending an abstract idea. 'State authority,' 'Democracy,' 'Pacifism,' 'International Solidarity,' etc., are merely ideas with us which we always convert into fixed and purely doctrinaire conceptions, so that all matters of urgent national necessity are judged from that point of view.

In almost every respect in which the Pan-German movement failed, the dispositions of the Christian-Socialist Party were well and correctly thought out.

It had the necessary understanding of the significance of the masses, and from the very start it attracted to itself a certain section of them by outspoken assertion of its solid character. And since it did really set out to win the lower and middle classes, it gained a faithful and permanent following, ready for self-sacrifice. It avoided fighting with any religious institution and thus gained support from the powerful organization represented by the Church. It realized the value of propaganda on a large scale and specialized in influencing psychologically the instincts of the masses.

The fact that this party failed in its dream of saving Austria was due to its methods, which were mistaken in two respects, and to the obscurity of its aims. Instead of being founded on a racial basis, its anti-Semitism depended on the religious conception. The reason why this error crept in was the same as that which caused the second mistake. Its founders thought that if the Christian-Socialist Party was to save Austria, it ought not to take its stand on the racial principle, since a general dissolution of the State would shortly follow in any case. The leaders of the Party considered that the situation in Vienna demanded all possible avoidance of tendencies toward disruption, and support of all points of view conducing to unity.

Vienna was at that time so strongly impregnated with Czech elements that nothing but extreme tolerance in regard to all racial problems could keep those elements from being anti-German from the start. If Austria was to be saved, they could not be dispensed with. Thus, the party leaders made special efforts to win the very large number of small Czech traders in Vienna by opposing the Manchester liberal school of thought, and they hoped thereby to have discovered a war cry for the fight against Judaism based on religion, which would put all differences of race in the old Austria in the shade.

It is obvious that a fight on such a basis would worry the Jews to a very limited degree. If the worse came to the worst, a drop of Holy water would always get them out of their troubles and preserve their Judaism at the same time.

This doing things by halves destroyed the value of the anti-Semitic position of the Christian Socialist Party.

It was sham anti-Semitism and was almost worse than none at all, for people were lulled into security and thought they had the enemy by the ears, whereas they were really led by the nose themselves.

If Dr. Karl Lueger had lived in Germany, he would have counted as one of the great men of our race; it was his misfortune and that of his work that it lay in that impossible State, Austria. At the time of his death, the little flame in the Balkans was already beginning to spread more greedily with each month that passed, so that kindly Fate spared him the pain of seeing what he still believed he would be able to prevent.

The Pan-German Movement was quite right in its theory as to the aim of German regeneration, but I was unlucky in its choice of methods. It was nationalist, but, alas! Not social enough to win the mass of the people. Its anti-Semitism was based on a true appreciation of the importance of the racial problem and not on the theories of religion. On the other hand, its struggle against the definite creed erred both as regards facts and tactics.

The Christian-Socialist movement's ideas about the aim of a German revival were too vague, but, as a party, it was fortunate and intelligent in its choice of methods. It realized the importance of the social question, but was mistaken in its fight against the Jews and was quite ignorant of the strength and conception of nationality.

At that time I was prey to discontent, the more I realized the hollowness of the State and the impossibility of saving it. I felt with the absolute certainty that in all things it stood for the unhappiness of the German race. I was convinced that the State was sure to check and obstruct every really great German and to support every man and every thing that was un-German. I hated the motley collection of races displayed in the capital. I hated the motley collection of Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croats, and above all that ever present fungoid Growth – Jews and again Jews!

Seeing that my heart was never in love with an Austrian Monarchy, but ever beat for a German Reich, I could only regard the collapse of that State as the beginning of salvation for the German nation. Therefore, my longing grew ever greater to go to the land, whither my secret love and desire had drawn me from my earliest youth. I hoped to make a name as an architect one day, and, whether Fate made me great or not, to dedicate my devoted service to the Nation. I wanted to have my share of fortune, to be on the sport and play my part in the country where my heart's most burning desire was destined to be fulfilled: the union of my beloved home with the common Fatherland, the German Reich.

Vienna gave me the hardest and most thorough schooling in my whole life; only now do I fully appreciate the essential value of those years of discipline. That is why I have treated that period rather fully – because it gave me my first instruction in the questions affecting the principles of the party, which, having started on a very small scale, is, after barely five years, [1] well on its way to become a great popular movement. I do not know what my attitude towards Judaism, Social Democracy, all that is meant by Marxism, the social question, etc., would have been today if the force of destiny had not at that early period of my life given me a foundation of opinions based on personal experience.

[1] Written in 1924

IV

MUNICH

IN THE spring of 1912, I went to Munich. A German town! How different from Vienna! I felt badly when I thought of that Babylon of races. The dialect was nearly the same as my own and reminded me of my own youth with its connection with Lower Bavaria. In a thousand ways, it was or became dear to me. I belong to that town more than to any spot in the world, and this is due to the fact that it is inseparably bound up with my own development.

In Austria, the only adherents of the alliance idea were the Habsburgs and the Germans. In the first it was due to compulsion and calculation, and in the second to easy credulity, because they imagined they would do a great service to the German Empire by means of the Triple Alliance which would strengthen it and bring it security; political stupidity, because their imaginations did not fit the facts, for they were really helping to chain the Empire to the dead carcass of a State which was bound to drag them down into the abyss; more particularly, however, because that alliance was contributing more and more to de-Germanize Austria herself. For since the Habsburgs believed an alliance with the Empire would ensure them against any interference on the part of the later – and unfortunately they were right in this – they were enabled to continue their policy of gradually getting rid of German influence inside the country with more ease and less risk. They had no need to fear any protest from the German Government, which was known for the 'objectivity' of its point of view, and, moreover, in dealing with the Austrian Germans they could always silence any insistent voice which might be raised against some particularly disgraceful instance of favoritism shown to the Slavs, by a reference to the Triple Alliance.

If there had been more enlightened study of history and racial psychology in Germany, no one could have believed for an instant that the Quirinal in Rome and the Hofburg in Vienna would ever fight side by side on a common battlefront. Italy would turn into a volcano before any Government would dare send a single Italian into the field, except as an enemy, on account of the fanatically hated Habsburg State. I had more than once seen flare up in Vienna the passionate disdain and unfathomed hatred, which obsessed the Italians against the Austrian State. The errors of the House of Habsburg in the course of centuries against Italian freedom and independence were too great ever to be forgotten, even supposing there was any desire to do so. There was no such desire either among the people or among the Italian Government. For Italy, therefore, there were only two possible courses in dealing with Austria – alliance or war. Having chosen the first, they could calmly prepare for the second.

The German alliance policy was both senseless and risky, especially since Austria's relations with Russia had been tending more and more towards a settlement by war.

Why was any alliance concluded at all? Simply in order to assure the future of the Reich when it was in a position to do so standing on its own feet. But the future of the Reich was nothing else than the question of enabling the German nation to continue its existence.

The population of Germany increases by 900,000 souls annually. The difficulty of nourishing this new army of subjects must necessarily be aggravated each year and end in catastrophe, unless ways and means are found in time to forestall the danger.

There remained only two ways to obtain work and bread for the thriving people: either territorial acquisition or a policy of colonial trade. Both these courses were considered, examined, recommended, and combated from various points of view, until finally the second was chosen. The first course would have undoubtedly been the sounder of the two. Acquisition of fresh territory to accommodate the overflow population contains infinitely greater advantages, especially of the future, and not the present, is considered.

There is another reason why this solution would have been the right one: Many European States today are like pyramids standing on their points. Their possessions in Europe are ridiculous compared with their top-heavy burden of colonies, foreign trade, etc. One might say: point in Europe, base all over the world; in contradistinction tom the American Union, whose base covers its own continent and whose apex is its point of contact with the rest of the globe. Hence the vast internal strength of that State and the weakness of most European colonizing Powers.

Even England is no proof to the contrary, for we are too apt to forget the true nature of the Anglo-Saxon world in its relation to the British Imperium. If only on account of her community of language and culture with the American Union, England cannot be compared with any other state in Europe.

Hence Germany's only hope of carrying out a sound territorial policy lay in acquiring fresh lands in Europe itself. Colonies are useless for that object if they appear unsuitable for settling Europeans in large numbers. in the nineteenth century, however, it was no longer possible to acquire such territory for colonization by peaceful methods. A colonizing policy of that kind could only be realized by means of a hard struggle, which would be far more appropriate for the sake of gaining territory in the continent near home than for lands outside of Europe.

For such a policy, there was only one ally in Europe – England. England was the only Power which could protect our rear, supposing we started a new Germanic invasion *(Germanenzug)*. We should have had just as much right to do this as our forefathers had. Our pacifists do not hesitate to eat the bread of the East, although the first ploughshare was the sword.

No sacrifice would have been too great in order to gain England's affection. It would have meant renunciation of colonies and importance on the sea and refraining from interference with British industry by our competition.

There was a moment when England would have let us speak to her in this sense; for she understood very well that, owing to her increased population, Germany would have to look for some solution and find it either in Europe, with England's help, or elsewhere in the world without it.

The attempt, made form London at the turn of the century, to obtain a *rapprochement* with Germany was due first and foremost to this feeling. But the Germans were upset by the idea of 'having to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire for her' – as if an alliance were possible on any basis other than that of reciprocity! On that principle business could very well have been done with England. We should have known that British diplomacy was too clever to grant any favors without reciprocity on our part.

Let us imagine that Germany, with a skillful foreign policy, had played the part that Japan played in 1904 – we can hardly estimate the consequences that would have had for Germany.

There would never have been a World War

That method, however, was never adopted at all.

There still remained the possibility: industry and world-trade, sea-power and colonies. If a policy of territorial acquisition in Europe could only be pursued in alliance with England against Russia, a policy of colonies and world-trade, on the other hand, was only conceivable in alliance with Russia against England. in this case they should have drawn their conclusions ruthlessly and have sent Austria packing. They adopted a formula of 'peaceful economic conquest of the world,' which was destined to destroy forever the policy of force, which they had pursued up to that time. Perhaps they were not quite certain of themselves at times when quite incomprehensible threats came across from England. Finally, they made up their minds to build a fleet, again not for the purpose of attacking and destroying England, but to defend the 'world-peace' and for the 'peaceful conquest of the world.' Thus, they were constrained to maintain it on a modest scale, not only as regards numbers, but also as regards the tonnage of individual ships and their armaments, so as to make it evident that their final aim was a 'peaceful' one.

The talk about 'peaceful economic conquest of the world' was the greatest piece of folly ever set up as a leading principle in State policy, especially as they did not shrink from quoting England to prove that it was possible to carry it out in practice. The harm done by our professors with their historical teaching and theories can scarcely be made good again, and it merely proves in a striking fashion how many 'learn' history without understanding it or taking it in. Even in England they had, had to confess to a striking refutation of the theory; and yet no nation had ever prepared better for economic conquest with the sword, or later maintained it more ruthlessly than the British. Is it not the hallmark of British statecraft to make economic gains out of political strength and at once to reconvert each economic gain into political power? Thus it was a complete error to imagine that England personally was too cowardly to shed her blood in

defense of her economic policy! The fact that the British possessed no national army was no proof to the contrary; for it is not the military form of the national forces that matters, but rather the will and determination to make use of what there is. England always possessed the armaments she needed. She always fought with whatever weapons were necessary to ensure success. She fought with mercenaries as long as mercenaries were good enough; but she seized hold of the best blood in all the nation, whenever such a sacrifice was needed to make victory sure; but determination to fight, tenacity, and unflinching conduct of her wars were there always.

In Germany, however, as time went on they encouraged, by means of the schools, the press, and the comic papers, an idea of British life, and even more so, of the Empire, which was bound to lead to the most ill-timed self-deception; for everything became gradually contaminated with this rubbish, and the result was a low opinion of the British which ended by revenging itself most bitterly. This mistaken idea ran so deeply that everyone was convinced that the Englishman, as they imagined him, was a businessman both crafty and incredibly cowardly. It never occurred to our worthy professorial importers of knowledge that anything as vast as the British world Empire could never have been assembled and kept together merely by swindling and underhand methods. The few who gave warnings were either ignored or silenced. I remember distinctly the amazement on the faces of my comrades in arms when they came face to face with the Tommies in Flanders. After the very first days of fighting, it dawned on the brain of each man that those Scotchmen did not exactly correspond with the people whom writers in comic papers and newspaper reports had thought fit to describe to us.

I began to reflect then on propaganda and the most useful forms of it.

This falsification certainly had its convenience for those who propagated it; they were able to demonstrate by examples, however incorrect they might be, the rightness of an economic conquest of the world. We were bound to succeed where the Englishman had succeeded; while the fact that we were very much more honest – being free from that specifically British *perfidie* – was held up as a special advantage. It was hoped that it would attach the smaller nations to us and win the confidence of the larger ones.

The value of the Triple Alliance was psychologically of little importance, since the binding force of an alliance decreases the more it confines itself to maintaining an existing condition. On the other hand, an alliance waxes stronger the more the individual contracting Powers are able to hope they will gain definite, tangible aims of expansion; in which case, as always, strength lies not in defense, but in attack.

This was realized in various quarters, but unluckily not by the so-called 'professionals.' Ludendorff, then a colonel in the Great General Staff, in particular, pointed out this weakness in a memorandum in 1912. Naturally, the 'statesman' refused to attach any significance or importance to the matter.

For Germany, it was a pure piece of luck that the War broke out in 1914 indirectly by way of Austria, and that the Hapsburgs were thus forced to take part in it; if it had happened the other way round, Germany would have been left all by herself.

The Austrian connection robbed Germany of the best and most promising prospects which alliances might have given her. In place of them, in fact, there was continually increasing tension with Russia and even Italy. In Rome feeling was universally pro-German, while, deep down in the heart of every single Italian, it was anti-Austrian and frequently burst out in a blaze.

In the modest company that I frequented, I made no attempt to hide my conviction that, that wretched treaty with a State doomed to destruction would lead to a catastrophic collapse of Germany unless she managed to break loose from it while there was yet time. I never deviated for a moment from that conviction, firm as a rock, when the torrent of the World War appeared finally to have made reasonable reflection impossible and the rush of enthusiasm carried along with it those highly placed ones whose sole duty was cold consideration of realities. Even when I myself was at the front, whenever the problem was discussed I expressed my opinion that the quicker the alliance was broken off the better it would be for the German nation, and that to sacrifice the Habsburg Monarchy would be no sacrifice for Germany if she could thereby reduce the number of her enemies, since the millions of steel helmets had not been assembled in order to maintain a decrepit dynasty, but to save the German Nation.

Before the War, it seemed at times as though there were signs that in one camp at least there was a slight doubt as to the correctness of the alliance policy that was being pursued. From time to time Conservative circles in Germany started to warn against too much trustfulness, but, like everything else that was reasonable, the warning was thrown to the winds. They were convinced that they were on the road to conquer the world, that success would be unlimited, and that nothing would have to be sacrificed.

Once more the 'non-professionals' were marching straight to destruction, drawing the innocent nation after them like the rat-catcher of Hamelin.

The victorious march of German technical skill and industry, the swelling triumphs of German trade, caused them to forget the fact that all this was only possible on the assumption of a strong State. Many, on the contrary, went so far as to proclaim their conviction that the State owed its life simply to these developments, that it was first and foremost an economic institution and should be conducted according to the rules of economics, so that it should really depend for its existence on commerce, a condition which was held to be far the healthiest and most natural of all conditions.

The State, however, has nothing to do with any definite economic conception or economic development. It is not an assembly of commercial negotiators during a period with defined limits for the purpose of carrying out economic objects, but the organization of a community, homogenous in nature and feeling, for the

better furtherance and maintenance of their type, and the fulfillment of the destiny marked out for them by Providence. This and nothing else is the object and significance of a State.

The Jewish State never had boundaries, as far as space was concerned; it was unlimited as regards space, but bound down by its conception of itself as a race. That people therefore was always a State within the State. It was one of the cleverest tricks ever invented when that State was stamped with 'religion' and so assured of the tolerance, which the Aryan is always ready to extend to religious creeds. For the Mosaic religion is really nothing but a doctrine for the preservation of the Jewish race. Hence, it embraces nearly every branch of sociological, political, and economic knowledge that could ever come into question in connection with it.

Whenever there was an advance of political power in Germany, business also began to look up; whereas, whenever business monopolized the life of our people and smothered the virtues of the mind, the State broke down again and dragged business along with it.

And yet if we ask ourselves what the forces are which make and maintain States, we find that they come under one single denomination: ability and readiness to sacrifice the individual for the sake of the community. That these virtues have no relation to economics is obvious from the simple realization that man never sacrifices himself for the purposes of business – i.e., men do not die for business, but for ideals. Nothing displayed the Englishman's psychological superiority in realization of a national ideal better than the reasons he put forward for fighting. While we fought for daily bread, England fought for freedom – not her own, but that of the little nations. In Germany, they mocked at this effrontery and got angry, proving thereby how thoughtless and stupid Germany's so-called statecraft had become before the War. We had not the slightest conception of the nature of the forces that could lead men to their death of their own free will and volition.

As long as the German people continued to think in 1914 that they were fighting for ideals, they stood their ground; but the moment it became evident that they were merely fighting for their daily bread, they were glad to throw up the sponge.

Our intelligent 'statesman,' however, were amazed at this change of temper. The pre-War belief that it was possible to lay the world open for the German nation, or indeed conquer it, by the peaceful method of a policy of trade and colonization was a classic sign that the genuine virtues which make and maintain States, and all the resulting insight, will-power, and determination to accomplish great things were gone. By law of nature, the immediate result of this was the World War with all its consequences.

I now for the first time turned these questions over in my mind, colored, as they were, by my position towards Germany's alliance policy and the economic policy

of the Empire from 1912 to 1914, and I found that the solution of the riddle lay more and more certainly in that force with which I had made acquaintance, but from quite another standpoint, in Vienna: the doctrine and world view of Marxism and its organizing influence.

Innumerable times I began to consider how an attempt might be made to master that world-pestilence. I studied the aims, the struggles, and the success of Bismarck's' special legislation. My study gradually gave me principles of granite for my own convictions – so much, so that since then I have never had to think of changing my personal views on the question. I made also a deep study of the relation between Marxism and Judaism.

In 1913 and 1914 I began to express my conviction in various circles, which today are in part still true to the National-Socialist movement, that the question of the future for the German nation is that of the destruction of Marxism.

The internal decline of the German nation had begun a long time before that, but, as in life, people were not clear about the destroyer of their existence. They sometimes tried treatment for the disease, but they often mistook the symptoms for the cause. As no one knew this or wished to know it, the fight against Marxism was worth no more than the nonsensical recommendations of a quack.

V

The World War

IN MY excitable youth, nothing had worried me so much as having been born in a time when it was evident that the only people who had temples erected in their honor were merchants and State officials. The waves of political events appeared to have calmed down to such an extent that the future seemed really to belong to 'peaceful competition between nations'; i.e., quiet mutual swindling, stopping short of violent methods. The various States began showing favor to enterprises which cut the ground from under each other, stole each other's customers and contracts, and sought to take advantage of each other in every possible way, the whole scene being staged with a din as harmless as it was noisy. This development not only appeared to be permanent, but it seemed – with universal approval – to be going to remodel the world at one blow as a single vast warehouse, in the vestibules of which busts of the craftiest profiteers and the least go-ahead officials would be stored to all eternity.

Why could I not have been born a hundred years earlier? – Somewhere about the time of the War of Liberation, when a man was still worth something, quite apart from 'business'?

When the news of the murder of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand reached Munich (I was in the house at the time and only heard vaguely how it all happened), my first fear was that the bullets were perhaps those of the pistols of German students, who, being exasperated by the favor which the Heir Presumptive perpetually showed to the Slavs, desired to free the German nation from their domestic enemy. I could quickly imagine what the result of that would be: a fresh wave of persecution that would now be 'explained and justified' before the whole world. But when immediately afterwards I heard the names of the alleged criminals and that they were known to be Serbs, I began to feel a slight horror at the vengeance of inscrutable Destiny.

The greatest friend of the Slavs had fallen a victim to the bullets of Slav fanatics.

An injustice is being done today to the Vienna Government when reproaches are showered upon it regarding the form and contents of the ultimatum that it issued. No other Power in the world could have acted differently in a similar situation. On her southern border, Austria possessed an inexorable and mortal enemy who at constantly shorter intervals challenged the Monarchy and would never have given over until the favorable moment arrived for laying the Empire in ruins. There was good reason to fear that this would come to pass as soon as the old Emperor died; when that happened, the Monarchy might perhaps no longer be able to offer serious resistance. In recent years, the State had depended on the life of Francis Joseph so greatly that his death would, in the eyes of the mass of the people, have been equivalent to the death of the State itself.

Yes, it is really unjust to Government circles in Vienna to reproach them with having forced on the War which might perhaps have been avoided otherwise. It could not have been avoided, but it might have been postponed for one, or perhaps two, years at most. But the curse of German as well as Austrian diplomacy was that it had always tried to put off the inevitable day of reckoning till it were forced to strike the blow at an unfavorable hour. We may be certain that any further attempt to preserve peace would have brought on the War at a moment still less favorable.

For many years, the Social Democrats had been agitating in Germany for war against Russia in the most disgraceful fashion, whereas the Centre Party for reasons of religion had pivoted German policy mainly on Austria-Hungary. Now the consequences of that error had to be endured. What happened was bound to happen and under no circumstances have been averted. The guilt of the German Government lay in the fact that, merely for the sake of preserving peace, it missed the favorable moment for action, got entangled in an alliance for maintaining peace in the world, and thus finally became the victim of a world coalition which opposed the urge to maintain peace in the world with a determination to bring on a world war.

The struggle of 1914 was not forced on the masses, good heavens! But was passionately desired by the whole nation. They wanted to see an end to the general uncertainty. That is the only reason why over two million German men and youths willingly joined the colors for that fearful struggle and were prepared to defend them with the last drop of their blood. A war had broken out faster than the world had ever seen.

Scarcely had the news of the outrage become known in Munich when two ideas at once entered my head: first, that was absolutely inevitable, and, secondly, that the Habsburg State would be forced to stick to its alliance; for what I had most feared was the possibility that one day Germany herself, perhaps directly because of that alliance, would slip into a conflict of which Austria might not have been the immediate cause, and that the Austrian State, for reasons of internal politics would not develop sufficient resolution to come to the assistance of its ally. The old State had to fight, whether it wished to or not.

My own attitude towards the conflict was both simple and clear. in my eyes it was not Austria fighting to get a little satisfaction out of Serbia, but Germany fighting for her life, the German nation for its 'to be or not to be' its freedom and future. It would have to follow in Bismarck's footsteps; young Germany must again defend what the fathers had heroically fought for from Weissenburg to Sedan and Paris. But if the struggle was to be a victorious one, our people would by their own force take their place again among the great nations, for the German Reich could not stand up as a mighty guardian of peace unless it was prepared to curtail its children's daily bread for the sake of that peace.

On the Third of August, I addressed a petition to His Majesty King Ludwig III to be allowed to serve in a Bavarian regiment. The Cabinet Office during those days certainly had its hands pretty full, and my joy was all the greater when my petition was granted the same day.

Now began for me as for every German, the greatest and most unforgettable period of my life on earth. Compared with the events of that mighty struggle all the past fell into empty oblivion. I think with pride and sorrow of those days, and back to the weeks of the beginning of our nation's heroic fight, in which kind Fortune allowed me to take part.

Thus, it went on from year to year; horror had taken the place of the romance of fighting. Enthusiasm gradually cooled off and the glorious exuberance was drowned in the agony of death. A time came when each man had to struggle between the urge of self-preservation and the call of duty. By the winter of 1915-16, this struggle was over within myself. My will was at last victorious. In the early days, I was able to join in the attack with cheers and laughter; now I was calm and determined. Thus, I went on until the end.

The young volunteer had grown into an old soldier. This change had taken place throughout the army. The perpetual fighting aged and hardened it, and broke any who could not stand up against the storm.

Then only could one form a judgment of that army. After two - three years, during which it was continually fighting one battle after another, against superior odds in numbers and weapons, undergoing hunger and privations – that was the time to consider the virtue of that army.

Though thousands of years pass, none may talk of heroism without thinking of the German army in the World War. Through the mists of the past the grey steel helmet will appear, never flinching or turning aside, a monument of immortality. As long as there are Germans left, they will reflect that these men were once sons of their nation.

In those days, I cared nothing for politics, but I could not help forming an opinion on certain manifestations that affected the whole nation, but concerned us soldiers most of all.

I was angered by the way it was considered right to consider Marxism. Marxism, the final and perpetual aim of which is the destruction of all non-Jewish national States, saw, to its disgust in those days of July, 1914, how the German working class, which it had been assiduously ensnaring, had waked up and was ranging itself more and more rapidly hour by hour in the service of the Fatherland. In a few days the fog and deception of that infamous national betrayal had dissipated into thin air, and the gang of Jewish leaders suddenly found themselves alone and deserted, just as though not one trace of the folly and madness with which the masses had been inoculated for sixty years was left in existence. That was a bad moment for the betrayers of German Labor. As soon, however, as the leaders realized the danger threatening them, they hastily

drew the tarn cap of lies over their ears and impudently mimicked the national uprising.

But now was the moment to attack the whole treasonable association of those Jewish poisoners of our nation.

Now – because the German workers had rediscovered the road to nationality – it should have been the Government's anxious care to root out without mercy those who were agitating against nationality. At a time when the best were falling at the front, those who stayed might at least have extirpated the vermin. Instead of this, His Majesty the Emperor in person stretched out his hand to the old criminals, gave them his protection, and enabled them to maintain their association.

Every general world-theory *(Weltanschauung)*, whether religious or political in nature – it is sometimes hard to say where one begins and the other ends – fights not so much negatively to destroy the opposing world of ideas as positively to establish its own. Thus, its struggle lies in attack rather than defense. Hence, definiteness of its aim gives it an advantage, for that aim is the victory of its own ideas, whereas it is hard to define when the negative aim of destroying the hostile doctrine can be said to be attained and assured. Hence, a world-theory is more definite in plan as well as more powerful in attack than in defense, for the final decision lies in attack and not in defense.

Every attempt to combat a world theory by means of force comes to grief in the end so long as the struggle fails to take the form of aggression in favor of a new intellectual conception. It is only when two world-theories are wrestling on equal terms that brute force, persistent and ruthless, can bring about a decision by arms in favor of the side that it supports. It was on this account that the fight against Marxism had failed up to that time. It was the reason why Bismarck's legislation regarding Socialism failed in the end in spite of everything, and was bound to fail. It lacked the platform of a new world-theory, to establish which the fight might have been fought; for only the proverbial wisdom of high State officials could find it possible to imagine that the twaddle about so-called 'State authority' or 'order and tranquility' is a sufficient inducement to fight to the death.

In 1914, a contest against Social Democracy was in fact conceivable, but the lack of any practical substitute made it doubtful how long such a contest could have been maintained successfully. In that respect there was a serious blank.

Long before the War, I held this opinion, and for that reason, I could not make up my mind to join any one of the parties then existing. As the World War went on, I was confirmed in my opinion still further by the obvious impossibility, directly owing to the lack of a movement, which would have to be much more than a Parliamentary Party, of resuming the fight ruthlessly against Social Democracy.

I frequently talked about it to my more intimate comrades. It was then that I first conceived the idea of becoming an active politician later on; and this was the reason why I often assured the small circle of my friends that I wished to work after the War as a speaker, in addition to my own profession.

VI

War-Propaganda

AT THE time when I was following all political events with attention, the business of propaganda was always of extreme interest to me. In it I saw an instrument which the Socialist-Marxist organization had long controlled with masterly skill and employed to the full. I soon came to realize that the right use of propaganda was a regular art which was practically unknown to the bourgeois parties. The Christian-Socialist movement alone, in Lueger's time especially, applied the instrument with a certain virtuosity and owed much of its success to it.

Had we any propaganda at all?

Alas! I can reply no. All that was undertaken in that direction was so inadequate and wrong-headed from the start as to be not of the slightest use – sometimes it did actual harm. A systematic examination of the German war-propaganda leaves no doubt that it was insufficient in form and wrong psychologically.

We even seem to have been uncertain as to the basic question: Is propaganda a means to an end?

It is a means, and must be judged from the point of view it is to serve. It must be suitably shaped so as to assist that objective. It is also clear that the importance of the objective may vary from the standpoint of general necessity and that the essential qualities of propaganda must vary so as to be in harmony with it . The objective we fought for, as the War went on, was the noblest and most compelling which is imaginable to man. It was the freedom and independence of our nation, security for future nourishment and – the nation's honor.

As regards the question of humanity, Moltke has said that in war the essential is to bring the matter to a finish quickly, and that the severest methods conduce most effectively to that end.

Propaganda in the War was a means to an end, and the War was a struggle for the life of the German nation; therefore, propaganda could only be founded on principles that were of value to that objective. The cruelest weapons were humane if they conduced to a speedier victory.

This was the only possible attitude to adopt towards the question of war-propaganda in a life and death struggle such as this.

If those in high positions had been clear about the foregoing, there would have been no uncertainty as to the form and employment of this weapon; for it is nothing more or less than a weapon – a really terrible one in the hands of one who understands it.

All propaganda should be popular and should adapt its intellectual level to the receptive ability of the least intellectual of those whom it is desired to address. Thus, it must sink its mental elevation deeper in proportion to the numbers of the mass whom it has to grip. If – as with propaganda for carrying through a war –

the object is to gather a whole nation within its circle of influence, there cannot be enough attention paid to avoidance of too high a level of intellectuality.

The receptive ability of the masses is very limited, their understanding small; on the other hand, they have a great power of forgetting. This being so, all effective propaganda must be confined to very few points which must be brought out in the form of slogans until the very last man is enabled to comprehend what is meant by any slogan. If this principle is sacrificed to the desire to be many-sided, it will dissipate the effectual working of the propaganda, for the people will be unable to digest or retain the material that is offered them. It will, moreover, weaken and finally cancel its own effectiveness.

It was, for instance, fundamentally wrong to paint the enemy in a ridiculous light, as the Austrian and German comic papers made a point of doing in their own propaganda; wrong, because, when the enemy was actually met with in the flesh, our men were bound at once to receive a totally different impression of him, which subsequently took its revenge in a most terrible manner; for the German soldier, under the direct impression of the enemy's power of resistance, now felt he had been deceived by the fabricators of his information up to that moment, and, instead of strengthening or at least confirming his fighting keenness, it did the opposite. The men broke down under it.

On the other hand, the British and American war-propaganda was psychologically correct. By displaying the German to their own people as a barbarian and a Hun, they were preparing the individual soldier for the horrors of war and so helped to spare him disappointments. The most terrible of the weapons which now came against him were now for him merely a confirmation of the information which he had already received, and reinforced his faith in the truth of his Government's assertions, while it heightened his rage and hatred against the villainous enemy.

Thus, the British soldier never felt that the information he got from home was untrue, while the German ended by rejecting all that came from that quarter as pure swindle and *Krampf.*

What, for instance, should we say about a poster advertising a new soap if it described other soaps as being 'good'? We should shake our heads over it.

It was fundamentally wrong, when discussing the subject of war-guilt, to suggest that Germany could be counted as partly responsible for the outbreak of that catastrophe; the proper thing would have been to lay the burden of it without cease upon the enemy, even if this did not correspond with the true course of events, as was nevertheless the actual fact. The masses are in no position to distinguish where foreign illegality begins and our own ends.

An immense majority of the people are so feminine in nature and point of view that their thoughts and actions are governed more by feeling and sentiment than by reasoned consideration. This sentiment is, however, not complicated, but very simple and consistent. It does not differentiate much, but it is either positive or negative, love or hate, truth or lies, never half one and half the other, and so on.

This fact was exploited by the British propaganda with very real genius. In England there were no half-statements that might have given rise to doubts.

The proof of their understanding of the primitiveness of sentiment in the mass of the people lay in the publication of horrors, which suited this condition and both cleverly and ruthlessly prepared the ground for moral solidity at the front even when great defeats came along, and by nailing down the German enemy as being the sole cause of the War – a lie, the unqualified impudence of which, and the way it was put before the nation, took account of the sentimental and extremist nature of the public, and so gained credence.

Alteration of methods should not alter the essence of what propaganda is meant to effect; its purport must be the same at the end as at the start. The slogan may have various lights thrown upon it, but any treatment applied to it should always finish with the slogan. Propaganda can work solidly and consistently in no other way.

The success of any advertisement, whether in business or politics, is due to the continuity and consistency with which it is employed. The example of enemy propaganda was typical of this also. It confined itself to few points of view, was addressed solely to the masses, and was pursued with untiring perseverance. Throughout the whole War, use was made of the basic ideas and forms of expression found to be right at the beginning, and even the slightest alteration was never considered. At first, it appeared lunatic from the impudence of its assertions – later on, it became unpleasant, and was finally believed. At the end of four and a half years, revolution broke out in Germany, and its war cries were inspired by the enemy's war-propaganda.

The British understood yet another thing – that this intellectual weapon can only be used successfully with the masses, but that, if successful, it richly repays what it costs.

Propaganda counted with them as a weapon of the first class, whereas with us it was the last way for officeless politicians to make a living and a tiny berth for modest heroes.

Taken all in all, its success was just nil.

VII

THE REVOLUTION

IT WAS the summer of 1915 that the enemy began dropping leaflets on us from the air. Their contents were almost always the same, although there were variations in the form or presentation: Distress was continually on the increase in Germany ; the War was never going to stop, while the prospect of winning it was growing even fainter; the people at home were yearning for peace, but 'militarism' and the Kaiser would not allow it; the whole world - to whom this was well known – was therefore not waging war against the German nation, but solely against the man who alone was responsible, the Kaiser: so that the War would not come to an end until that enemy of peaceful humanity was removed. But the liberal and democratic nations, after the War was over, would receive the German nation into the league of perpetual world peace, which was assured, once 'Prussian militarism' was destroyed.

One point in this kind of propaganda should be noted. On every part of the front where there were Bavarians, it made a dead set at Prussia, declaring not only that Prussia the real guilty party, but that in the Allied countries there was no enmity at all against Bavaria; there was, however, no possibility of helping her as long as she joined in serving Prussian militarism and in pulling its chestnuts out of the fire.

Even in 1915, this kind of persuasion really began to achieve a definite effect. Feeling against Prussia among the troops grew up quite visibly – and the authorities never once took measure to stem it.

By 1916, the complaining letters from home were having a direct influence, and it was now no longer especially necessary for the enemy to disseminate these complaints at the front by means of leaflets from the air. The silly letters written by German women cost hundreds of thousands of men their lives in the period that followed.

There were already objectionable phenomena. The front cursed and groused, and was angry and discontented – sometimes rightly so. While they starved and suffered, their people at home sat in poverty, while others had more than enough and reveled. Even at the battlefront, all was not as it should be in this respect.

Crises easily arose, but these were 'domestic' events. The same man who had groused and grumbled did his duty silently a few minutes later, as if it was quite natural. A company, which had been discontented, clung on to the bit of trench that it had to defend as though Germany's fate depended on those few hundred meters of mud-holes. At the front, it was still the old glorious army of heroes.

I was wounded in October 1916, but I happily had been brought back and was ordered home to Germany by ambulance train. Two years had passed since I had last seen my home, an almost endless time under such circumstances. I went to a hospital near Berlin. What a change!

Alas! The world was a new one in other respects. The spirit of the army at the front seemed to have no place here. I came across for the first time something that was so far unheard of at the front – boasting of one's own cowardice!

As soon as I was properly fit to walk, I obtained leave to visit Berlin. Bitter poverty was evident everywhere. The city of millions was starving. There was much discontent. In some houses, where soldiers visited, the tone was much the same as at the hospital. One got the impression that those fellows purposely looked for such spots in which to air their opinions.

In Munich, conditions were far, far worse. When I had recovered and was discharged from the hospital, I was sent to the reserve battalion and I felt I hardly recognized the town again – anger, discontent, and curses wherever I went. The soldiers returned from the front had certain peculiarities, explicable from their service at the front, which were quite incomprehensible to the elderly commanders of reserve units, but were obvious for an officer who had himself just come back. The respect paid by the men to such a one was quite different from that given to an officer at the rear. With these exceptions, the general spirit was wretched. Scrimshanking almost counted as a sign of higher intelligence, devotion to duty as a mark of weakness and narrow-mindedness. The offices were full of Jews. Almost every clerk was a Jew, and almost every Jew a clerk. I was amazed at this mass of fighters of the chosen race, and could not help comparing it with the sparseness with which they were represented at the front.

In the business world, it was still worse. Here the Jewish nation had actually become 'indispensible.'

The munitions strike at the end of 1917 did not produce the hoped-for result in starving the front of arms; it collapsed too quickly for the lack of munitions, by itself – was intended – to condemn the army to defeat. But how great and how disgraceful was the moral harm which had been done!

First, what was the army going on fighting for if even the people at home did not desire victory? For whom these vast sacrifices and privations? The soldier was to fight for victory; at home, they are striking against it!

Secondly, what effect was it having on the enemy?

In the winter of 1917-18, dark clouds covered the firmament of the Allied world. All the hopes founded on Russia were at an end. The ally who had offered the biggest blood-sacrifice at the altar of their joint interests had reached the end of his strength and lay at the mercy of his pitiless assailant. Fear and gloom entered the hearts of soldiers, who up to then had been possessed by blind faith. They feared the coming spring. For, seeing that they had so far failed to break the German when he could place only part of his forces on the Western Front, how were they to count on victory, now that the undivided forces of that tremendous State of heroes appeared to be gathering for an attack against the West?

At the moment that the German divisions received their final orders for the great attack, the General Strike broke out in Germany. The world was dumfounded at

first. Then the enemy propaganda breathed again and pounced on this help at the eleventh hour.

Here at one blow was the means for reviving the sinking confidence of the Allied soldiers, for representing the chance of victory as being now a certainty once more, and for turning the terrified depression with regard to coming events into determined confidence.

British, French, and American newspapers started sowing this conviction in the hearts of their readers, while immensely clever propaganda was used to excite the troops at the front.

'Germany on the eve of Revolution! An Allied Victory Inevitable!' This was the best medicine to set the wavering Tommy or *poilu* on his feet again.

All this was the result of that munitions strike. It revived faith in victory in the enemy nations and did away with that crippling depression on the Allied front; as a consequence thousands of German soldiers paid for it with their blood. But the promoters of that rascally and disgraceful strike were those who expected to obtain the highest posts under the State in revolutionary Germany.

It was my good luck to be in the first two and the last offensives. The latter made on me the most tremendous impression that I ever received in the whole of my life – tremendous, because for the last time the struggle lost its character of a defensive and became an offensive, as it was in 1914.

At the height of the summer of 1918, it was stifling hot all over the front. There were quarrels going on at home. What about? In the various units of the army there were many rumours. It seemed that the War was now hopeless, and only fools could think that we were going to win. It was not the nation, but the capitalists and the Monarchy, which were interested in going on with it. This was the news from home, and it was discussed at the front.

At first, the front reacted to it very little. What did universal suffrage matter to us? Was that what we had been fighting for, for four years? The front, in its old stable condition, had very little use for the new war-aims of Messrs Ebert, Scheidemann, Barth, and Liebknecht. We could not make out why the shirkers had a right to arrogate to themselves control of the State.

My political notions were fixed from the start. I loathed that whole wretched gang of party hacks who had betrayed the nation. I had long seen clearly that, that gang was not really thinking about the good of the nation, but of filling their own empty pockets. And the fact that they were prepared to sacrifice their country for that, and to let Germany go under if necessary, made them fit to be hanged in my eyes. Attention paid to their wishes meant sacrificing the interests of the working classes for the benefit of a lot of pick-pockets; carrying of them into practice was impossible unless we were prepared to let Germany go. Far the greater part of the army still thought the same as I did. In August and September, the signs of decay increased more and more rapidly, although the effect of the enemy attacks was not at all to be compared with the frightfulness of our own

defensive battles. In comparison with them, the Somme and Flanders battles were things of the past, a ghastly memory.

By the end of September, my division for the third time arrived at the positions we had stormed as a young volunteer regiment. What a memory! Now, in the autumn of 1918, the men had become different; there was political discussion among the troops. The poison from home was beginning to have its effect here as everywhere. The young drafts succumbed to it altogether – they had come straight from home.

During the night of October 13 -14, the British began to throw gas-shells on to the southern front before Ypres. We were still on a hill south of Werwick on the evening of October 13, when we came under a drumfire lasting several hours, which continued throughout the night with more or less violence. About midnight a number of us dropped out – some forever. Towards morning I felt a pain which got worse with every quarter-hour that passed, and at about seven o'clock, I tottered rearwards with scorching eyes, reporting myself for the last time in that war. A few hours later my eyes had turned into burning coals, and it was all dark around me. I was sent to hospital at Pasewalk in Pomerania and while there, I was destined to see the Revolution.

Bad rumours kept on coming in from the navy which was said to be in a ferment, but this seemed to me to be something born of the excited imagination of a few youths rather than a matter affecting large numbers of men. In hospital, everyone talked of the end of the War, which they hoped as swiftly approaching, but no one imagined it was to come immediately. I was unable to read the newspapers.

In November, the general tension increased. Then one day the disaster came upon us suddenly and without warning. Sailors arrived in lorries and called on all to revolt, a few Jewish youths being the leaders in that struggle for the 'freedom, beauty, and dignity' of our national life. Not one of them had ever been to the front.

The following days brought with them the worst period of my life. The rumours grew more and more definite. What I imagined to be a local affair was apparently a general revolution. In addition to all this, distressing rumors came back from the front. They wanted to capitulate. Yes – was such a thing possible?

On November 10, the aged pastor came to the hospital for a short address; then we heard everything. I was present and profoundly affected. The old man seemed to be trembling when he told us that the House of Hohenzollern was to wear the German Imperial crown no more – that the Fatherland had become a Republic.

So all had been in vain. In vain all the sacrifices and privations, in vain the starvation and thirst for many endless months, in vain the hours we spent doing our duty, gripped by the fear of death, and in vain the death of two millions of men!

And our country?

But – was this the only sacrifice we should be called on to endure? Was the Germany of the past worth less than we thought? Had she no obligation to her own history? Were we worthy to clothe ourselves in the glory of the past? In what light could this act be presented for justification to future generations?

Miserable, depraved criminals!

The more I tried in that hour to get clear ideas about that tremendous event, the more did I blush with burning rage and shame. What was all the pain of my eyes in comparison with this misery?

There were horrible days and worse nights to follow. I knew that all was lost. In those nights, my hatred arose against the originators of that act.

The Emperor William had been the first German Emperor to offer the hand of friendship to the leaders of Marxism, little guessing that scoundrels are without honor. While they held the Imperial hand in theirs, their other hand was already feeling for the dagger.

With Jews there is no bargaining – there is merely the hard 'either – or.'

I resolved to become a politician.

VIII

THE START OF MY POLITICAL LIFE

AT THE end of November 1918, I returned to Munich. I rejoined the reserve battalion of my regiment, which was in the hands of the 'Soldiers' Councils.' The whole thing was so repulsive to me that I promptly resolved to get out of it as quickly as I could. Accompanied by my faithful comrade in the War, Schmiedt Ernst, I went to Traunstein and stayed there until the camp was broken up. In March 1919, we retuned to Munich.

The situation was an impossible one, and tended irresistible towards an extension of the Revolution. Eisner's death only hastened developments and led finally to a dictatorship of the Councils, better described as transitional control by the Jews, which was the original aim and idea of those who originated the Revolution. At that period, endless schemes drove through my head.

In the course of the new Revolution, my earliest actions drew on me the ill will of the Central Council. On March 27, 1919, I was almost arrested early in the morning, but when I presented my rifle at my would-be captors, the three youths lost courage and returned the way they had come.

A few days after the liberation of Munich, I was summoned to attend a commission to inquire into the revolutionary events in the Second Infantry Regiment.

This was my first incursion into more or less pure politics. A few weeks after that, I was ordered to attend a 'course' for members of the Defense Force. The intention underlying this course was to supply the soldier with definite principles to guide his thoughts as a citizen of a State. As far as I was concerned, its value consisted in the fact that I should be able to make the acquaintance of a few comrades who thought as I did, and with whom I could thoroughly discuss the situation of the moment. We were all more or less convinced that Germany could not be saved from the collapse, which was becoming more and more imminent, by the perpetrators of the crime of November, the Centre and Social-Democratic Parties; also that the so-called 'Bourgeois-National' groups could, with the best will in the world, never be capable of repairing the damage which had been done.

Thus, formation of a new party was discussed in our small circle. The ground principles that we contemplated were the same that were realized later on in the German Worker's Party. The title of the new movement was to point from the start to the possibility of penetrating the mass of the people; for, if it lacked this quality, the whole work seemed pointless and superfluous. Therefore, we decided to call it the 'Social Revolutionary Party' – because the social idea of the new foundation did really involve a revolution.

There was, moreover, an even deeper reason. All of the attention I had devoted earlier in my life to economic problems had always left me more or less on the edge of the ideas arising out of my consideration of social problems. It was not until later that I widened these boundaries as a result of my

consideration of Germany's policy of alliances. The latter was very largely the result of a false estimate of economics and vagueness as to the principles on which the German nation was to be provided with food in the future. These ideas were based on the assumption that in all cases capital was merely an outcome of labor, and, moreover, was, like labor itself, the basis for correcting all the factors which can either further or restrict human activity. This, then was the national significance of capital – that it itself depended so entirely on the greatness, freedom and power of the State – i.e., the nation – that the union of the two by itself was bound to lead to the State and the nation being helped forward by capital, by the simple method of maintaining and increasing itself. This dependent connection of capital with the free, independent State obliged the latter to aim at making the nation free and powerful.

Thus, the State's duty towards capital was comparatively simple and clear. It merely had to see that capital remained the servant of the State and did not contemplate obtaining control of the nation. In taking this attitude, the State could confine itself to two objects: maintenance of efficient national and independent economy on the one hand, and of the social rights of the workers on the other.

I had been unable before then to distinguish as clearly as I should have liked between capital, purely the final outcome of creative labor, and capital which owed its existence exclusively to speculation. I had not known how to start thinking about it. The subject was now being dealt with exhaustively by one of the various lecturers in the course, which I mentioned above – Gottfried Feder.

Immediately after listening to Feder's first lecture, the idea entered my brain that I had at last discovered the road to one of the essential principles on which a new party might be founded.

I recognized at once that it was a question here of a theoretical truth which would be of immense importance to the future of the German nation. The sharp severance of stock exchange capital from the finances of the nation offered a possibility of combating internationalization of Germany's financial administration, without having to threaten the principle of an independent national existence with a struggle against capital. Germany's development was too clearly before my eyes for me not to be aware that the hardest fight would have to be fought out, not against the enemy nations, but against international capital. Feder's lecture gave me a splendid war cry for the coming struggle.

In this case, also later developments have proved how correct our feeling was at that period. We are no longer derided by our foolish bourgeois politicians; even they realize today, unless they lie in their throats, that international capital was not only the greatest of war agitators, but that, even now that the War is over, it spares no pains to turn the peace into a hell.

For myself and all other true National-Socialists, there is only one doctrine: Nation and Fatherland. What we have to fight for is security for the existence and increase of our race and our nation, nourishment of it's children, and purity of its blood, freedom and independence for the Fatherland, and that our nation may be able to ripen for the fulfillment of the mission appointed for them by the Creator of the universe.

I was beginning to learn afresh, and now only came to a right comprehension of the teachings and intentions of the Jew, Karl Marx. Only now did I properly understand his *Capital*, and likewise the struggle of Social Democracy against the economies of the nation, and the fact that its aim is to prepare the ground for the domination of the truly international capital of the financiers and the stock exchange.

In another way, also this course produced great results. One day I announced my intention to speak. One of those taking part thought he would break a lance for the Jews, and started to defend them in a long argument. This roused me to opposition. An overwhelming majority of those present took my side. The result was, however, that a few days later, I was ordered to join a Munich regiment nominally as 'instructor.'

At that time, discipline was rather slack amongst the troops. They were suffering from the aftermath of the period of Soldier's Councils. It was only by degrees and cautiously that the transition from obedience 'by consent' – the pretty way they described the pigsty under Kurt Eisner – to military discipline and subordination could be effected. In the same way, the troops had to learn to feel and think of themselves as members of the nation and the Fatherland. My new activities lay in this direction. I started them full of love and keenness. I may claim some success; in the course of my addresses, I won hundreds, nay, thousands of my comrades back to their nation and Fatherland. I 'nationalized' the troops and was able to help generally to strengthen discipline. Moreover, I made the acquaintance of a number of comrades who thought as I did and who joined me later on in laying the foundations of the new movement.

IX

THE GERMAN WORKER'S PARTY

ONE DAY I received orders form my headquarters to find out what was going on in a society, which was apparently political and which was to hold a meeting during the next few days under the name of the 'German Worker's Party'; Gottfried Feder was going to speak at it. I was to go to the meeting and have a look at the people, and then make a report.

The curiosity felt in the army regarding political parties, was more than comprehensible. The Revolution had given soldiers the right to be active in politics, and all of them, down to the most inexperienced, made full use of it. But it was not until the Centre and Social Democratic Parties realized to their sorrow that the sympathies of the soldiers were beginning to turn away from the revolutionary parties toward the National movement and resuscitation of the country that they saw cause for withdrawing the franchise from the army and prohibiting its taking a hand in politics.

The bourgeoisie, which was really suffering from senile weaknesses, thought in all seriousness that the army would return to its former condition of being simply part of the defenses of Germany, while the idea of the Centre and the Marxists was merely to draw the dangerous poison-tooth of nationalism, without which an army is nothing but a perpetual police force, and is no longer a military force capable of withstanding an enemy; this was amply proved in the years that followed. So, I decided to attend the above-mentioned meeting of this party of which I had no anterior knowledge at all.

I was glad when Feder's discourse was over. I had seen enough and was preparing to depart when the announcement that anyone might now speak, induced me to stay. Nothing worth remarking seemed to be happening until suddenly a 'professor' rose to speak, who threw doubts on the correctness of Feder's reasoning, and then – after Feder had replied very well to him – suddenly appealed to the 'basis of facts' and took on himself to suggest that the young party was the one best adapted to take up the struggle for cutting Bavaria loose from Prussia. The man had the impudence to assert that, if this happened, German Austria would immediately join up with Bavaria, and the Peace would then be greatly improved for Germany, and other like nonsense. On that I simply had to apply for leave to speak and tell the learned gentleman my opinion on that point – so successfully that the chairman ran out of the building like a drenched poodle before I had finished.

During the day, I thought more than once about the matter, and was prepared to drop it for good, but to my astonishment less than a week later, I received a postcard to say I had been admitted as a member of the German Worker's Party; I was also invited to attend a committee meeting of that party on the following Wednesday.

I was more astonished at this method of getting members, and did not know whether to be annoyed or to laugh at it. I had never imagined myself joining a ready-made party; I wanted to found one for myself. Truly the notion never occurred to me.

I was just going to send my answer in writing to the authors of the invitation, when curiosity had its way, and I resolved to be there on the day mentioned in order to explain my reasons by word of mouth.

Wednesday arrived. I was rather taken aback on being told that the president of the Society for the Reich was to be present in person. I wanted to postpone my declaration for a bit. At last he appeared. It was the man who had been leading speaker when Feder gave his lecture.

This made me curious again, and I stayed to see what would happen. At any rate, I learned the names of these gentlemen. The president for the organization in the Reich was a Herr Harrer; the Munich chairman was Anton Drexler.

The minutes of the last meeting were read, and a vote of thanks given to the lecturer. Then came the election of new members – i.e., the business of admitting myself.

I began to ask questions. Apart from a few leading principles, there was nothing- no program, not a leaflet, nothing at all in print, not even a miserable rubber stamp; but obviously plenty of faith and good intention.

I no longer wanted to smile. I well knew what these men were feeling; it was a longing for a new movement, which should be more than a party in the accepted sense of the word. The hardest question of my life confronted me. I should never have joined one of the existing great parties, and I shall explain my reasons more precisely. In my eyes it seemed an advantage that this ridiculous little band, with its handful of members, had not stiffened into an 'organization,' but still offered the individual a real opening for personal activity. There was work to be done, and the smaller the movement was, the sooner it could be pulled properly into shape. It was still possible to determine the character, objective, and methods of this society, and that was quite impossible in the case of the existing great parties.

The longer I turned it over in my mind, the more the conviction grew in me that some small movement such as this might pave the way for national resurrection, but that the political parties in Parliament never would, for they clung far too closely to obsolete conceptions, or had an interest in propping up the new regime. For what had to be proclaimed here, was a new theory of the world, and not a new election-cry.

After two days of agonized meditation and questioning, I finally made up my mind to take the step. It was the decisive turning point of my life. Retreat was neither possible nor desirable.

That is how I became a member of the German Worker's Party, and was given a provisional ticket of membership, bearing number 'Seven.'

X

THE PREMONITORY SIGNS OF COLLAPSE IN THE OLD EMPIRE

THE Blow from which the German Reich and nation are suffering is so heavy, that they seem to have lost all power of feeling or reflection, as if seized with vertigo. It is hardly possible to recall the former heights, so dreamlike and unreal seem the greatness and glory of those times, compared with present misery; which explains why men were only too easily dazzled by greatness, and forgot to seek for the premonitory signs of the great collapse, which nevertheless must have been present in some form.

These signs were visibly present, although very few tried to glean any definite teaching from them. This is necessary today more than ever.

Most people in Germany now recognize the German collapse merely by the general economic poverty and its results. Almost everyone is personally affected by it – an excellent reason for every individual to realize the catastrophe. But the people as a whole do not connect the collapse with political, cultural or moral questions.

That this is so with the masses goes without question; but the fact that the intelligent sections of the community regard the collapse first of all as an 'economic catastrophe' and think that recovery must come from the side of economics is one of the reasons why so far, no cure has been possible. Not until it is realized that economies can only come second or even third, and that factors of ethics and race must come first, will there be understanding of the causes of the present unhappiness or a possibility of discovering means and methods of curing it.

The easiest, and therefore most commonly believed, cause of our misfortunes and of the present rot is the loss of the War. Probably there are many who seriously believe this nonsense, but there are even more on whose lips such an argument is a conscious lie. This last applies to all those who are crowding round the governmental feeding-trough.

Did not the apostles of world-reconciliation declare that the German defeat merely destroyed 'militarism' and that the German people would rejoice in their glorious resurrection? For was not the whole Revolution ushered in with the phrase that by it victory was withheld from the German standard, but that by it alone the German nation would fully attain to liberty at home and abroad? Was this not so, you lying rascals?

It is characteristic of truly Jewish impudence that the military defeat is now put down as the cause of the collapse, while the central organ of all treason, the *Vorwärts* of Berlin, wrote that this time the German nation was not to be permitted to bring its banner home in victory! Is this now to be taken as the cause of our collapse?

The answer to the assertion that the loss of the War is the cause may be answered as follows:

Of course, the loss of the War had a fearful effect on the destiny of our country, but it was not a cause, but a result of causes. All intelligent and well-wishing people well know that an unhappy ending of that life and death struggle, must lead to disastrous results. But there were people, unfortunately, whose reasoning powers seemed to fail them at the proper moment, or who, although they knew better, fought against the truth and denied it. They are really the guilty causes of the collapse, and not the loss of the War, as they now suddenly choose to maintain. For the loss of the War was merely a result of their action, and not, as they now assert, due to 'bad leadership.' The enemy were not composed of cowards; they, too, knew how to die; from the very first day they were more in number than the German army, and for their technical armaments, they had the whole world in their service; and yet we cannot get rid of the fact that the German victories, which continued through four years of hard fighting against the whole world were due, apart form all the heroism and fine organization, solely to consummate leadership. The organization and leadership of the German army were the greatest the world has ever seen. The failures lay in the limitations of human powers of resistance.

The collapse of that army was not the cause of our present misfortunes, but merely the consequence of other crimes, a consequence that ushered in a further collapse, and this time a more visible one.

Are nations, in fact, ever ruined by the loss of a war and by that alone? This can be very briefly answered. It is always so if the military defeat of the nation has been due to laziness, cowardice, want of character – in fact, unworthiness on that nation's part. If it is not so, the military defeat will become a spur to a greater recovery in the future, and not the tombstone of the nation.

History provides innumerable instances to prove the correctness of this statement.

Germany's military defeat was alas! Not an undeserved catastrophe, but a merited chastisement of eternal retribution. The defeat was more than deserved by us.

If the front, left to itself, had really given way, and if the natural disaster had been really due to its failure, the German nation would have accepted the defeat in quite another spirit. They would have borne the misfortunes, which followed with clenched teeth or would have been overwhelmed by sorrow. Rage and fury would have filled their hearts against the enemy to whom tricks played by fortune or destiny had given the victory. There would have been neither mirth nor dancing, cowardice would not have swelled with pride and glorified the defeat, the fighting troops would not have been mocked at and their colors dragged in the dirt; but, above all, that disgraceful state of affairs would never have arisen which induced a British officer, Colonel Repington, to proclaim with scorn; 'Every third German is a traitor.'

No, the military collapse was itself but the consequence of a series of unhealthy manifestations and of those who promoted them; they had already

been infecting the nation in times of peace. The defeat was the first visible catastrophic result of a moral poisoning, a weakening of the will to self-preservation, and of doctrines which had begun many years previously to undermine the foundations of nation and Reich.

It was natural that the whole abysmal, lying spirit of Jewry, and the fighting organization of Marxism should see to it that the very man should be burdened with direct responsibility for the disaster who all by himself attempted with superhuman will and energy to divert the catastrophe which he had foreseen, and to save the nation from a period of deep pain and humiliation. By taxing Ludendorff with the responsibility for losing the World War, the took the weapon of moral justification out of the hand of the only adversary dangerous enough to be likely to succeed in bringing the betrayers of the Fatherland to justice.

We may almost regard it a great stroke of luck for the German nation, that the period of creeping sickness came to a head and was stemmed so suddenly in that terrible catastrophe; for if things had happened differently, the nation would have gone on to ruin, more slowly, perhaps, but also more surely. The disease would have become chronic, whereas, in the acute form of the disaster, it at least became clear and obvious to the eyes of a considerable number of observers. It was not by accident that men conquered the plague more easily than tuberculosis. The first comes in terrifying waves of death and gives a shock to mankind, the other creeps on slowly; the first induces terror, the other gradual indifference. The result is that men fight the first with the whole of their energy, while they try to stop consumption with feeble methods. Thus, men conquered the plague, but tuberculosis conquers them. The same applies to diseases of the body politic.

In the long peace of the pre-War years, certain evils appeared and were recognized as evils, although practically no attention was paid to the causes of them – with certain exceptions. These exceptions were first and foremost the phenomena in the economic life of the nation, which struck individual people more keenly than the evils which appeared in many other directions.

There were many signs of decay, which ought to have induced serous thought.

The amazing increase of population of Germany before the War brought the question of providing the essential nourishment into a more and more prominent place in all political and economic thought and action. But, unfortunately, they could not make up their minds to go straight to the correct solution, for they imagined they could obtain their object by cheaper methods. Renunciation of the idea of acquiring fresh territory, and substitution for it of the craze for economic conquest, were bound to lead in the end to limitless and injurious industrialization. The first and most fatal result was the enfeeblement of the agricultural class, which it brought about. In proportion as this class sank, the proletariat crowded into the large towns, grew in numbers, until finally equilibrium was utterly lost.

The violent cleavage between rich and poor now became prominent. Superfluity and poverty lived so close side by side, that the consequences were

bound to be deplorable. Poverty and great unemployment began to play havoc with the people, and left discontent and bitterness behind them.

There were even worse phenomena involved by the industrialization of the nation. Along with the definite establishment of Commerce as mistress of the State, money became a god whom all had to serve, and before whom everyone must bow. A period of demoralization began, especially bad because it set in at a time when the nation needed more than ever, heroic inspiration of the highest order at an hour when danger was presumably menacing it. Germany ought to have been preparing to support with the sword, her effort to make sure of her daily bread by means of 'peaceful economic labors.'

Unfortunately, domination by money received sanction in the very quarter, which ought to have been most opposed to it. It was a particularly unhappy inspiration when His Majesty induced the nobility to enter the circle of the new finance. It must be admitted in excuse for him that even Bismarck failed to realize the danger; but in practice, it drove the ideal virtues into the second place behind that of money, for it was clear that, having once taken that road, the nobility of the sword would very soon have to play second fiddle to that of finance.

Before the War, internationalization of German business was already on its way, traveling the by-paths of share issues. A section of German industry did make a determined attempt to avert the danger, but in the end, it fell a victim to the combined attacks of greedy capital, greatly assisted by its truest friend, the Marxist movement.

The persistent war against the 'heavy industries' of Germany was the visible start of the internationalization, which was being striven for with the help of Marxism in the Revolution. As I write these words, success is attending the general attack on the German State Railways, which are to be turned over to the international capitalists. Thus, 'International' Social Democracy has once again attained one of its main objectives.

The best evidence of the success of the industrializing process in Germany is the fact that when the War was over, one of the leaders of German industry and trade, was able to state his opinion that commerce was the one force, which could set Germany on her legs again. These words uttered by Stinnes, caused incredible confusion; but they were caught up and have become with startling rapidity, the motto of all the humbugs and chatterers, who in the guise of 'statesmen' have been squandering the fortunes of Germany since the Revolution.

One of the worst evidences of decadence in Germany before the War was the universal half-heartedness that was displayed more and more in everything that was undertaken. It is always the result of a man's uncertainty about a thing and the pusillanimity arising from that and other causes. The system of education was the cause of this defect. There were a great number of weak points in German education before the War. It was fashioned on a one-sided system, with a view to mere knowledge and very little with a view to producing practical ability.

Still less score was set on formation of character, very little on encouraging the joy of responsibility, and none at all on the cultivation of will power and decision. The result of this was not the strong man, but rather the pliable possessor of much knowledge – and that was what we Germans were universally considered to be before the War, and for which we enjoyed consideration. The German was liked because he was a useful man, but owing to the weakness of his will power, he was little respected. There was a good reason for his dropping nationality and Fatherland more easily than the citizen of almost any other nation. That fine proverb 'With one's hat in one's hand, one can go all over the world' describes it all.

This pliability became disastrous when it governed the form under which alone the Monarch might be approached. The form insisted on no answering back, but agreement with everything that His majesty chose to ordain. And yet, it was in that quarter, that the dignity of a free man was most needed; otherwise, such subservience was bound one day to be the ruin of the Monarchy.

This is good enough for toadies by profession, but all proper men – and the best men in the State still are that – will only feel repulsion when such nonsense is defended. For them, history is history and truth is truth, even when a monarch is concerned. No, the happiness of possessing a great man, and a great monarch combined, is so seldom the lot of nations, that they have to be content if cruel Destiny at least spares them a terrible misfit.

Thus, the virtue and significance of the monarchical idea cannot rest essentially in the person of the Monarch, unless Destiny deigns to set the crown on the brow of a brilliant hero such as Frederick the Great, or a wise character such as William I. This may happen only once in several centuries – hardly oftener. Otherwise, the conception takes precedence of the person, and its significance has to rest exclusively and intrinsically on the institution, and the Monarch himself enters the circle of those who serve it.

One result of wrong-headed education was fear of shouldering responsibility, and the consequent weakness in the handling of essential problems.

I will pack a few cases out of the mass of instances, which occur to me.

In journalist circles, it is customary to describe the press as a great power within the State. It is true that its importance is actually immense. It is hardly possible to overestimate it – what it does is really to continue education up to an advanced age.

It is an essential interest of the State and nation to see that the people do not fall into the hands of bad, ignorant, or indeed ill disposed teachers. It is the State's duty, therefore, to watch over the people's education, and prevent its taking a wrong direction, and it should keep an eye on what the press in particular is doing; for its influence on men is by far the strongest and most penetrating of all, since its action is not transitory, but continuous. Its immense importance lies in the uniform and persistent repetition of its teaching. Here, if anywhere, it is the State's duty not to forget that whatever it does must be directed at one aim, and one alone; it must not be led astray by the will o' the wisp of so-called 'freedom of the press' or be persuaded into neglecting its duties

and withholding the nourishment which the nation needs to keep it healthy. It must keep control of that instrument of popular education with absolute determination, and place it at the service of the State and nation.

What the so-called Liberal press did before the War was to dig a grave for the German nation and the German Reich. We need say nothing about the lying Marxist papers; to them lying is as much a necessary of life, as mewing is to a cat. Their sole object is to break the national and popular powers of resistance, to prepare them for the slavery of international capital and of their masters, the Jews.

What did the State do to counteract this wholesale poisoning of the nation? Nothing, absolutely nothing! A few feeble warnings, a few fines for offenses, too egregious to be overlooked, and that was all.

The defense put up by governments in those days against the press – controlled mainly by Jews – which was slowly corrupting the nation, followed no definite line, nor had it determination; but, worse than all, it had no fixed objective. The intelligence of the officials entirely missed the point, both in estimating the importance of the struggle, choice of methods, and settlement of a definite plan. They tinkered with it; now and then, if too sorely bitten, they scotched some journalistic viper for a few weeks or even months, but they always let the nest of snakes continue in peace as before.

For imperfectly educated, superficial readers the *Frankfurter Zeitung* is the essence of respectability. It never uses rough expressions, deprecates brute force, and always writes in favor of fighting with 'intellectual' weapons, and this appeals, curiously enough, to the least intellectual people.

But, it is just for our semi-intellectual classes that the Jew writes in his so-called 'Intelligentsia press.' The tone of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and *Berliner Tageblatt* is intended to appeal to them, and it is they who are influenced by those papers. While they most carefully avoid all coarseness of language, they use other vessels for pouring the poison into the hearts of their readers. In a medley of charming expressions, they lull their readers into believing that pure knowledge and moral truth are the driving force of their actions, whereas really it is a cunning contrivance for stealing a weapon, which their opponents might use against the press.

Readiness to be content with half-measures is the outward sign of inward decadence, and a national collapse is sure to follow sooner or later.

I believe that out present generation, if rightly led, will more easily master this danger. It has had certain experiences calculated to stiffen the nerves of anyone who has not completely missed the meaning of them. Certain it is, that some time or other, the Jew will cry out loudly in his newspapers, once a hand is laid on his beloved nest, by putting an end to the disgraceful use of the press, and once that instrument for education is brought into the service of the State, and is no longer left in the hands of aliens and enemies of the nation, I believe that it will be less of a burden to us younger ones, than it was to our fathers. A thirty-centimeter

grenade always hisses louder than a thousand Jewish newspaper vipers – so let them hiss!

The whole of education should be designed to occupy a boy's free time in profitable cultivation of his body. He has no right during those years to loaf about idly, and make disturbances in the streets and picture-houses, but after his day's work is done, he ought to harden his young body, so that life may not find him soft when he enters it. To prepare for this and to carry it out is the function of youthful education, and not merely to pump in so-called knowledge. It must rid itself of the notion that management of the body is the business of the individual alone. No one should be free to transgress at the expense of posterity, that is, of race.

The fight against the poisoning of the soul must be waged in company with cultivation of the body. Today all our life in public is like a forcing-bed for sexual ideas and attractions. Look at the bill of fare offered by the cinemas, playhouses, and variety theatres and you can hardly deny that this is not the right food, especially for the young. Hoardings and advertisement kiosks unite in drawing the public's attention in the most vulgar ways. Anyone who has not lost the capacity for entering into the souls of the young will realize that it must lead to their very grave injury.

The life of the people must be freed from the asphyxiating perfume of our modern eroticism, as it must be from unmanly and prudish refusal to face facts. In all things, the aim and method must be governed by the thought of preserving our nation's health both in body and in soul. The right to personal freedom comes second in importance to the duty of maintaining the race.

Similar unhealthiness was observable in almost every domain of art and *Kultur*. It was a sad sign of our internal decadence that it was impossible to let young people visit most of the so-called 'homes of art' (*Kunststätte*), considering what was shamelessly exposed to public view without warning – universal in the *Panoptica* – 'For Adults Only.'

To think that such precautionary measures should be necessary in the very places which ought to be first to provide material for forming the youth, not for amusing their *blasés* elders! What could the great dramatists of all times have said to such a warning and to the cause that made it necessary? Imagine the indignation of Schiller; how Goethe would have turned from it in fury!

But, indeed, what are Schiller, Goethe, or Shakespeare in comparison with the heroes of the new German poetry? Worn out and obsolete, altogether *passes*. For it is characteristic of the period not only that they produce nothing but filth, but that in addition, they throw mud at all that was really great in the past.

Thus, the saddest side of the condition of our national culture in the period before the War was not merely the complete impotence of our creative power in art and general culture, but also the spirit of hatred in which the memories of the greater past were besmirched and blotted out. In almost every domain of art, particularly in the drama and literature, all round the turn of the century, they produced less and less any new ting of importance, while they disparaged the

best age and called it inferior and obsolete; as if this present epoch could ever conquer any part of its shameful inferiority.

A study of religious conditions before the War will show how everything got into a state of disintegration. Even in this domain, large sections of the nation had entirely lost all solid and comprehensive conviction. In this those who were openly and officially at variance with the Church played a smaller part than those who were merely indifferent. Both creeds maintain missions in Asia and Africa for the purpose of attracting fresh adherents to their doctrines – an aspiration which can show but very moderate results in comparison with the progress made by the Mohammedan faith – whereas in Europe they are continually losing millions and millions of genuine adherents, who either are entirely estranged from the religious life or simply go their own way.

There are many signs of a struggle, every day increasing in violence, against the dogmatic principles of the various Churches, without which in practice religious belief is inconceivable in this world of humanity. The general mass of a nation do not consist of philosophers; faith for them is largely the sole basis for a moral view of life. The various attempts to find substitutes have not proved so suitable or successful as to be obviously a good exchange for the former religious confessions. If religious doctrine and faith really get a grip on the mass of the people, the absolute authority of that faith is then the whole basis of its efficacy. What, then, ordinary custom is for the general life – and without it thousands of men of superior culture would no doubt live reasonably and successfully, but millions of others would not – the law is for the State and dogma is for ordinary religion. It and it alone can defeat the unsteady, perpetually controverted, intellectual conception and mold it into a form, without which faith could ever exist. In the other event, the conception of a metaphysical view of life – in other words, philosophic opinion – could never have grown out of it. The attack upon dogma is in itself, therefore, very like the struggle against the general legal principles of the State, and just as the latter would end in complete State anarchy, the former would end in hopeless religious nihilism.

A politician, however, must estimate the value of a religion, not so much in connection with the faults inherent in it, but in relation to the advantages if a substitute which may be manifestly better. But until some such substitute appears, only fools and criminals will destroy what is there on the spot.

The fact that many people in pre-War Germany felt a distaste for the religious life must be ascribed to the misuse made of Christianity by the so-called 'Christian' Party and to the shamelessness of the attempt to identify the Catholic faith with a political party. This fatal aberration provided opportunities for a number of worthless members of Parliament, but it was the whole nation, which had to bear the consequences, seeing that the results it brought about in slackening religious life fell during a period when everything was beginning to slacken and shift, and traditional principles of morals and behavior were threatening to collapse.

The rifts and cracks in the fabric of our nation might have gone on without danger, so long as no special strain was put upon them, but they were bound to

cause disaster, when a rush of great events converted the question of the nation's internal solidarity into one of decisive importance.

In the domain of politics, also, an observant eye could mark evils that, unless alterations and improvements were soon taken in hand, were bound to count as indications of the approaching decay of the Empire's external and domestic policy.

There were plenty who watched these indications with anxiety and censured the lack of plan and thought in the policy of the Empire; they knew its inner weakness and hollowness very well, but they were mere outsiders in political life. Officialdom in the Government ignored the institutions of a Houston Stewart Chamberlain with the same indifference as they do today. These people were too stupid to think out anything for themselves and too conceited to learn what is needed from others.

One of the thoughtless observations one is apt to hear quoted today is that the Parliamentary system 'has been a failure since the Revolution.' This gives rise too easily to the assumption that it was any different before the Revolution. In reality, the effect of that institution is and can be only a destructive one, and this is what at a time when most people chose to wear blinkers, and saw nothing or chose to see nothing. For the fall of Germany was not a little due to that institution. Whatever fell under the influence of Parliament was done by halves, however one looks at it.

The Empire's policy of alliances was a weak half-measure. Though they wished to maintain peace, they could not help steering straight for war.

The Polish policy was a half-measure. They irritated the Poles without ever tackling the question seriously. The result was neither a victory for Germany, nor conciliation of the Poles, whereas she made an enemy of Russia.

The solution of the question of Alsace-Lorraine was a half-measure. Instead of brutally once and for all knocking the French hydra on the head, allowing, however, equal rights to the Alsatians, they did neither. Moreover, they could do nothing. The chief betrayers of their country kept their places in the ranks of the great parties – Wetterlé, for instance, in the Centre party.

While Jewry, through its Marxist and Democratic Parties, broadcast lies about German 'militarism' over the entire world, and tried to injure Germany by every means in its power, the Marxist and Democratic Parties refused to consider any comprehensive measure for completing the national forces of Germany.

The loss of the struggle for the freedom and independence of the German nation is the result of the peacetime half-heartedness and hesitation in calling up the combined strength of the nation in defense of the Fatherland.

One evil effect of the monarchial system was that it increasingly persuaded a very large section of the nation that as a matter of course government was from above and that the individual had no need to trouble himself about it. As long as government was really good, or at least meant well, matters went satisfactorily. But alas! Supposing a well-meaning old government was replaced by a fresh and

less conscientious one! The passive obedience and childlike faith were the worst evils imaginable.

But against these and other weaknesses, there were points of undoubted value.

First of all, stability in the State leadership secured by the monarchical form of State and withdrawal of all places under the State from the turmoil of speculation by greedy politicians; also the intrinsic dignity of the institution and the authority which this engendered; elevation of the officials as a body and of the army far above the obligations of party politics. Then the advantage due to the personal embodiment of the headship of the State in the person of the Monarch and the example of responsibility, which is laid upon the Monarch more heavily than on the chance mass of a parliamentary majority – the proverbial purity of German administration was ascribable to this first and foremost.

The army taught certain ideals and self-sacrifice for the Fatherland and its greatness, while in other callings greed and materialism had taken fast hold. It taught national unity as against division into classes, and perhaps its only failing was the institution of one-year volunteers. This was a failing because it broke through the principle of absolute equality and separated the better educated from the general military community; whereas the opposite would have been a better advantage. Considering the exclusiveness of our upper classes and their increasing estrangement from their own people, the army might have worked as a blessing if it avoided at any rate isolating the so-called intelligentsia within its ranks. It was a fault that it was not so; but what institution on this earth is faultless? But in spite of that, the good side was so preponderant that the few lapses were much under the average of human imperfections.

The greatest service performed by the army of the old Empire was that in an epoch of general counting by majority of heads, it placed the heads above the majority. Against the Jewish-Democratic idea of blind worship of majorities, the army held aloft that of faith in personality; for it taught what the later period most needed. In the sink of general softness and effeminacy there shot up in the ranks of the army each year 350,000 young men in the pride of their strength, who in two years' training forgot the softness of youth and acquired bodies strong as steel. It was only by those two years of obedience that a young man learned to command. One knew the trained soldier by his gait.

This was the school for the German nation, and it was not without reason that the inveterate hatred of those whose envy and greed required that the State should be powerless and its citizens weaponless was concentrated upon it.

To the State and the army were added the incomparable body of officials in the old Empire. Germany was the best organized and best administered country in the world. However much one might call the German State officials pedantic bureaucrats, this was no better in other States; on the contrary, it was worse. Other States did not posses that wonderful solidity of the apparatus nor the character of incorruptible honor in those who belonged to it. Better to be rather

pedantic, if honest and faithful, than enlightened and modern if at the same time inferior in character and – as often happens today – ignorant and incompetent.

The German official body and administrative machinery were especially distinguished by their independence of individual governments, whose transitory ideas in politics could not affect the position of the German State officials. The Revolution altered all of this fundamentally. Party considerations supplanted ability and competence, and an upstanding, independent character was more a disadvantage than a recommendation.

On these three, the State, the army, and the body of officials, rested the wonderful strength and effectiveness of the old Empire.

XI

NATION AND RACE

THERE are numberless examples in history, showing with terrible clarity how each time Aryan blood has become mixed with that of inferior peoples the result has been an end of the culture-sustaining race. North America, the population of which consists for the most part of Germanic elements, which mixed with very little with inferior colored nations, displays humanity and culture very different from that of Central and South America, in which the settlers, mainly Latin in origin, mingled their blood very freely with that of the aborigines. Taking the above as an example, we clearly recognize the effects of racial intermixture. The man of Germanic race on the continent of America, having kept himself pure and unmixed, has risen to be its master, so long as he does not fall into the shame of mixing the blood.

Perhaps the pacifist humane idea is quite a good one in cases where the man at the top has first thoroughly conquered and subdued the world to the extent of making himself sole master of it. Then the principle when applied in practice, will not affect the mass of the people injuriously. Thus, first the struggle and then pacifism. Otherwise, it means that humanity has passed the highest point in its development, and the end is not domination by any ethical idea, but barbarism, and chaos to follow. Some will naturally laugh at this, but this planet traveled through the ether for millions of years devoid of humanity, and it can only do so again if men forget that they owe their higher existence, not to the ideas of a mad ideologue, but to understanding and ruthless application of age-old natural laws.

All that we admire on this earth – science, art, technical skill and invention – is the creative product of only a small number of nations, and originally, perhaps of one single race. All this culture depends on them for its very existence. If they are ruined, they carry with them all the beauty of this earth into the grave.

If we divide the human race into three categories – founders, maintainers, and destroyers of culture – the Aryan stock alone can be considered as representing the first category.

The Aryan races – often in absurdly small numbers – overthrow alien nations, and, favored by numbers of people of lower grade who are at their disposal to aid them, they proceed to develop, according to the special conditions for life in the acquired territories – fertility, climate, etc. – the qualities of intellect and organization that are dormant in them. In the course of a few centuries, they create cultures, originally stamped with their own characteristics alone, and develop them to suit the special character of the land and the people that they have conquered. As time goes on, however, the conquerors error against the principle of keeping the blood pure (a principle which they adhered to at first), and begin to blend with the original inhabitants whom they have subjugated, and end their own existence as a peculiar people.

From all time, creative nations have been creative through and through, whether superficial observers do or do not realize it. Nothing but completed accomplishment is recognized by such people, for most men in this world are incapable of perceiving genius in itself, and see only the outward signs of it in the form of inventions, discoveries, buildings, paintings, etc. Even then, it takes a long time before they arrive at comprehending it. Just as individual genius strives, under the spur of special inducements, to work out expression of itself in practical ways, so, in the life of nations, actual application of the creative forces, which are in them is not produced except at the call of certain definite circumstances. We see this most clearly in the race, which was and is the carrier of human cultural development – the Aryan.

For the development of the higher culture, it was necessary that men of lower civilization should have existed, for none but they could be a substitute for the technical instruments, without which higher development was inconceivable. In its beginnings, human culture certainly depended less on the tamed beast and more on employment of inferior human material.

It was not until the conquered races had been enslaved that a like fate fell on the animal world; the contrary was not the case, as many would like to believe. For it was the slave who first drew the plough, and after him the horse. None but pacifist fools can look on this as yet another token of human depravity; others must see clearly that this development was bound to happen in order to arrive at a state of things in which those apostles are able to loose their foolish talk on the world.

Human progress is like ascending an endless ladder; a man cannot climb higher unless he has first mounted the lowest rung. Thus, the Aryan had to follow the road leading him to realization, and not the one that exists in the dreams of a modern pacifist.

But the road which the Aryan had to tread was clearly marked out. As a conqueror, he overthrew inferior men, and their work was done under his control, according to his will and for his purposes. But while extracting useful, if hard, work out of his subjects, he not only protected their lives, but also perhaps gave them an existence better than their former so-called freedom. So long as he continued to look on himself as the overlord, he not only maintained his mastery, but he was also the upholder and fosterer of culture. But as soon as the subjects began to raise themselves and – probably – to assimilate their language with that of the conqueror, the sharp barrier between lord and servant fell. The Aryan renounced purity of his own blood and with it his right to stay in the paradise he created for himself. He sank, overwhelmed in the mixing of races, and by degrees lost forever his capacity for civilization until he began to resemble the subjected aboriginal race more than his fathers, both in mind and body. For a time he could still enjoy the blessings of civilization, but first indifference set in, and finally oblivion. This is how civilizations and empires break up, to make room for new creations.

Blood mixture with the lowering of the racial level that accompanies it, is the one and only reason why old civilizations disappear. It is not lost wars that ruin mankind, but loss of powers of resistance, which belong to pure blood alone.

There is in our German language a word that is finally descriptive – readiness to obey the call of duty (*pflichterfullung*) – service in the general interest. The idea underlying such an attitude we call 'idealism' in contradistinction to 'egotism'; and by it we understand the capacity for self-sacrifice in the individual for the community, for his fellow men.

It is at times when ideals are threatening to disappear that we are able to observe an immediate diminution of that strength which is the essence of the community and a necessary condition of culture. Then selfishness becomes the governing force in a nation, and in the hunt after happiness, the ties of order are loosened and men fall straight to their destruction.

The exact opposite of the Aryan is the Jew. In hardly any nation in the world is the instinct of self-preservation more strongly developed than in the 'chosen people.' The best proof of this is the fact that the race still continues to exist. Where is there a people which for the last two thousand years has shown so little change in internal characteristics as the Jewish race? What race, in fact, has been involved in greater revolutionary changes than that one, and yet has survived intact after the most terrific catastrophes? How their determined will to live and to maintain the type is expressed by these facts!

The Jew's intellectual qualities were developed in the course of centuries. Today, we think him 'cunning' and in a certain sense, it was the same at every epoch. But his intellectual capacity is not the result of personal development, but of education by foreigners.

Thus, since the Jew never possessed a culture of his own, the bases of his intellectual activity have always been supplied by others. His intellect has in all periods been developed by contact with surrounding civilizations. Never the opposite.

It is utterly incorrect to point to the fact that the Jews hold together in struggling with their fellow men – or rather in plundering them – and conclude from it that they have a certain ideal of self-sacrifice.

Even in this the Jew is guided by nothing more or less than pure self-seeking; and that is why the Jewish State – which is supposed to be the living organism for maintaining and increasing a race – is entirely without frontiers. For the conception of a State with definite boundaries always implies the idealistic sentiment of a race within the State, also a proper conception of the meaning of work as an idea. For want of this conception, ambition is lacking to form or even maintain a State with definite boundaries. There is thus no basis on which a culture may be built up.

Thus, the Jewish nation, with all its obvious intellectual qualities, has no real culture – certainly none peculiar to itself. For whatever culture the Jew appears to

possess today is in the main the property of other peoples, which has become corrupted under his manipulation.

Originally, the Aryan was probably a nomad and then, as time went on, he became settled; this, if nothing else, proves that he was never a Jew! No, the Jew is not a nomad, for even the nomad had already a definite attitude towards the conception of 'work,' destined to serve as a basis for further development, so far as he possessed the necessary intellectual qualifications. But he did possess the power of forming ideals, if in a very rarified form, so that his conception of life may have been alien, but not unsympathetic, to the Aryan races. In the Jew, however, that conception has no place; he was never a nomad, but was ever a parasite in the bodies of other nations. His having on occasion having deserted his former sphere of life was not on all fours with his intentions, but was the consequence of his being at various periods ejected by the nations whose hospitality he had abused. His propagation of himself throughout the world is a typical phenomenon with all parasites; he is always looking for fresh feeding ground for his race.

His life within other nations can be kept up in perpetuity only if he succeeds in convincing the world that with him it is not a question of race, but of a 'religious bond' one however peculiar to himself. This is the first great lie!

In order to continue existing as a parasite within the nation, the Jew must set to work to deny his real inner nature. The more intelligent the individual Jew is, the better will he succeed in his deception – to the extent of making large sections of the population seriously believe that the Jew genuinely is a Frenchman, or an Englishman, a German or an Italian, though of a different religion.

The present vast economic development is leading to a change of the social stratification of the nation. The small industries are gradually dying out, making it rarer for the worker to be able to secure a decent existence, and visibly driving him to become one of the proletarian class. The outcome of all of this is the 'factory worker' whose essential distinguishing mark is that he is practically unable in later life to maintain his dignity and individuality. In the truest sense of the word, he is possessionless; old age means suffering to him and can hardly be called life at all.

There was once at an earlier period a similar situation, which was urgently in need of a solution; a solution was discovered. Beside farmers and artisans was appearing a new State, whose officials were servants of the State and possessionless in the truest sense of the word. The State found a way out of that unhealthy condition of things; it assumed responsibility for the welfare of its servant who was unable himself to provide for his old age, and instituted the pension on retirement. Thus a whole class, left without possessions, was skillfully delivered from social misery and incorporated in the body of the nation.

In late years, the State has had to face the same question on a far larger scale. Fresh masses of people, amounting to millions, have been constantly removing from the villages to the larger towns, to earn a living as factory workers in the new industries.

Thus, a new class has actually come into being to which but little attention has been paid, and a day will come when one will have to ask whether the nation has the strength by its own efforts once more to incorporate the new class in the general community or whether the distinction of class and class is to broaden into a rift.

While the bourgeoisie has been ignoring this most difficult question and letting things happen as they please, the Jew has been considering the boundless possibilities, which present themselves as regards the future. On the one hand he is making use of his capitalistic methods for exploiting humanity to the very full, and on the other he is getting ready to sacrifice his sway and very soon will come out as their leader in the fight against himself. 'Against himself' is, of course, only a figurative expression, for the great master of lies knows very well how to emerge with apparently clean hands and burden others with the blame. Since he has the impudence to lead the masses in person, it never occurs to the latter that it is the most infamous betrayal of all time.

The Jew's procedure is as follows: He addresses himself to the workers, pretends to have pity for their lot or indignation at their misery and poverty in order to gain their confidence. He takes trouble to study the real or imaginary hardness of their lives and to arouse a longing for a change of existence. With untold cleverness, he intensifies the demand for social justice dormant in all men of Aryan stock and so stamps the struggle for removal of social evils with a quite definite character of universal world importance. He founds the doctrine of Marxism.

By mingling it inextricably with a whole mass of demands, which are socially justifiable, he ensures the popularity of the doctrine, while on the other hand he causes decent people to be unwilling to support demands which, being presented in such a form, appear wrong from the start, nay, impossible of realization. For under the cloak of purely social ideas there lie hidden truly evil intentions, and these are brought into the open with impudent downrightness and frankness. By categorically denying the importance of personality, and so of the nation and its racial significance, they destroy the elementary principles of all human culture.

The Jew divides the organization of his world-teaching into two categories, which, though apparently separate, really form an inseparable whole; the political and labor movements.

The trades-union movement is the more wooing one. It offers the workman help and protection in his hard fight for existence, for which he has to thank the greed or short-sightedness of many an employer, and also the possibility of wresting better living conditions. If the worker shrinks from entrusting the blind caprice of men, often heartless and with but little sense of responsibility, with the defense of his right to live as a man, at a time when the State – i.e., the organized community – is paying practically no attention to him, he will have to protect his interests himself. Now that the so-called national bourgeoisie, blinded by money interest, is setting every obstacle in the way of this struggle for a living,

and is not only opposing, but universally and actively working against all attempts to shorten the inhumanly long hours of work, put an end to child labor, protect the women, and produce healthy conditions in factories and dwellings – the cleverer Jew is identifying himself with the underdog. He is gradually assuming leadership of the trades-union movement – all the easier because what matters to him is not so much genuine removal of social evils, as the formation of a blindly obedient fighting force in industry for the purpose of destroying national economic independence.

The Jew forcibly drives all competitors off the field. Helped by his innate greedy brutality, he sets the trades-union movement on a footing of brute force. Anyone with intelligence enough to resist the Jewish lure is broken by intimidation, however determined and intelligent he may be. These methods are vastly successful.

By means of the trades-union, which might have been the saving of the nation, the Jew actually destroys the bases of the nation's economics.

The political organization proceeds on parallel lines with the foregoing. It works with the trades-union movement, since the latter prepares the masses for the political organization, and in fact drives them forcibly into it. It is, moreover, the constant money source out of which the political organization feeds its vast machine. It is the organ of control for the political work and acts as whipper-in for all great demonstrations, political in character. Finally it loses its economic character altogether, serving the political idea with its chief weapon, the general strike.

By creating a press, which is on the intellectual level of the least educated, the political and labor organization obtain means of compulsion, enabling it to make the lowest strata of the nation ready for the most hazardous enterprises.

It is the Jewish press which, in an absolutely fanatical campaign of calumny, tears down all which may be regarded as a prop of a nation's independence, its civilization, and its economic autonomy. It roars especially against those who have strength of character enough not to bow to Jewish domination or whose intellectual capacity appears to the Jew in the light of a menace to himself.

The ignorance displayed by the mass of the people as to the true nature of the Jews and the lack of instinctive perception of our upper class make the people easy dupes of this Jewish campaign of lies. While the natural timidity of the upper class makes it turn away from a man who is being thus attacked by the Jews with lies and calumny, the stupidity or simple-mindedness of the masses causes them to believe all they hear. The State authorities either cower in silence or – more frequently still – in order to put an end to the Jews' press campaign, they persecute those who are being unjustly attacked, and this, in the eyes of such Jacks-in-office, stands for vindication of State authority and maintenance of peace and order.

Thus, if we review all the causes of the German collapse, the final and decisive one is seen to be the failure to realize the racial problem and, more especially, the Jewish menace.

The defeats on the field of battle of August, 1918, might have been borne with the utmost ease. It was not they that overthrew us; what overthrew us was the force that prepared for those defeats by robbing the nation of all political and moral instinct and strength, by schemes that had been underway for many decades. In ignoring the question of maintaining the racial basis of our nationality, the old Empire disregarded the one and only law that makes life possible on this earth.

The loss of racial purity ruins the fortunes of a race forever; it continues to sink lower and lower and its consequences can never be expelled again from the body and mind.

Thus, all attempts at reform, and all social work, all political efforts, every increase of economic prosperity, and every apparent addition to scientific knowledge went for nothing. The nation and the organism that made life possible for it on this earth – i.e., the State – did not grow sounder, but waned visibly more and more. The brilliance of the old Empire failed to conceal the inner weakness, and all attempts to add strength to the Reich came to nothing each time, because they persisted in ignoring the most essential questions of all.

That is why in August 1914, a nation did not rush full of determination into the battle; it was merely the last flicker of a national instinct of self-preservation face to face with the advancing forces of Marxism and pacifism, crippling the body of our nation. But since in those fateful days no one realized the domestic foe, resistance was all in vain, and Destiny chose not to reward the victorious sword, but followed the law of eternal retribution.

XII

THE FIRST PERIOD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY

IF I offer an account of the close of this first period in the development of our movement, and mention shortly a number of matters connected with it, my intention is not to give a dissertation on the theoretic aims of the movement. The latter has tasks and aims so tremendous that a whole section must be devoted to dealing with them. Therefore, I shall go thoroughly into the principles, as regards program, of the movement, and attempt to draw a picture of what we understand by the word 'State' in Part II of this volume. By 'we', I mean all the hundreds of thousands who in the main long for the same thing, but have not the words to express what is fluttering in their minds. For it is a remarkable fact of all great reforms that they often have only one man as champion from the start, but millions carry on the work. Their aim is frequently one, which has been desired in secret by hundreds of thousands for centuries, until one arises to proclaim the universal desire, and as its standard-bearer drives the old longing into victory in a new idea.

The deep discontent felt by millions proves that in their hearts they cherish a longing for a thorough change in conditions as they are today. There many who are sick of elections are a witness to this; also the numbers who incline to the fanatical extreme of the Left. It is to those that the young movement should first turn.

The question of recovering our nation's political power is first and foremost one of restoring our national desire for self-preservation, since experience shows that the building-up of foreign policy, and also assessment of the importance of any State, are based less on existing armaments than on the known or imagined powers of resistance of a nation. For an alliance is concluded not with weapons, but with men. Thus, the British nation will continue to be considered as the most valuable ally in the world as long as the world looks to the leadership and spirit of its people for ruthlessness and tenacity which is determined to fight out a struggle, once begun, by every means and without regard for time and sacrifice, right on to the victorious end; which proves that there is no need for the military armaments existing at any given moment to be in any special ratio to those of other States.

A young movement aiming consequently at reestablishing a German State with self-government will have to concentrate its forces on gaining the support of the mass of the people. Our so-called 'national bourgeoisie' is so hopeless, so greatly wanting in national sentiment, that there is certain to be a serious opposition from that quarter against a strong national policy at home and abroad. By reason of this same stupidity, however, the German bourgeoisie maintained

an attitude of passive resistance even against Bismarck in the hour of the coming liberation, and now also, owing to their proverbial timidity, there is no reason to fear any active opposition.

But with the mass of our compatriots with international sympathies, it is otherwise. Not only is their primitive nature more inclined to ideas of violence, but their Jewish leaders are more brutal and ruthless.

Added to this is the fact that the leaders of the parties of national betrayal must and will necessarily oppose any movement whatever for motives of self-preservation. It is historically inconceivable that the German Nation may return to its former position without first reckoning with those who gave the first impulse to the frightful disaster that visited our State. For before the judgment seat of the future, November 1918, will be tried not for high treason, but for betrayal of the nation.

Thus, any idea of restoring German independence is inseparably bound up with restoration of a determined spirit in our people.

It was clear to us, even in 1919, that the chief aim of the new movement must be to awaken a sentiment of nationality in the masses. From the tactical standpoint, a number of requirements arise out of this.

1. No social sacrifice is too great in order to win the masses over to the national movement. But a movement whose aim is to recover the German worker for the German nation must realize that economic sacrifices are not an essential factor in it, so long as the maintenance and independence of the nation's economic life are not menaced by them.

2. Nationalizing of the masses can never be effected by half-measures or by mild expression of an 'objective standpoint,' but by determined and fanatical concentration on the objective aimed at. The mass of the people do not consist of professors or diplomats. A man who desires to win their adherence must know the key that will unlock the door to their hearts. This is not objectivity – i.e., weakness – but determination and strength.

3. There can only be success in winning the soul of the people if, while we are conducting the political struggle for our own aim, we also destroy those who oppose it.

The masses are but a part of nature, and it is not in them to understand mutual hand-shakings between men whose desires are nominally in direct opposition to each other. What they wish to see is victory for the stronger and destruction of the weaker.

4. Incorporation of a section of the nation, which has become a class as part of the national whole, or simply of the State, is to be effected, not by debasing the higher classes, but by raising the lower ones. But the class entrusted with this process can never be the higher one, but the one which is fighting for the rights of equality. The bourgeoisie of today are not incorporated in the State by any help from the nobility, but by its own activity and under its own leadership.

The most serious obstacle in the way of approaching the worker of today is not his jealousy of his interests of a class, but the attitude of his international leaders, which is hostile to the nation and the Fatherland. Those same trade unions, if led

in a fanatically national spirit with regard to politics and nationality, would convert millions of workers into very valuable members of the nation, and this would be entirely unconnected with any struggles occurring here and there in the domain of pure economics.

A movement, which would honestly restore the German worker to his own people and rescue him from the madness of internationalism, must be in definite opposition to the attitude ruling among great employers, which interprets common nationality in the sense of helpless economic subjection of the employee to the employer.

The worker errors against the common nationality when, without regard to the common welfare and preservation of the nation's economy, he makes extortionate demands from confidence in his strength, just as gravely as the employer does when he misuses the working strength of the nation by inhuman methods of exploitation and makes extortionate profits out of the sweat of millions.

Thus, the reservoir from which the young movement should draw its adherents will be in the first place the body of workers. Its task will be to deliver them from the folly of internationalism, free them from their social poverty, raise them out of their cultural depression, and to convert them into a factor in the community, which shall be solid, valuable, and filled with national feelings and aspirations.

Our aim, in fact, is not to produce an upheaval in the national camp, but to win the anti-national camp over to our cause. This principle is an absolutely essential one for the tactical direction of the whole movement.

This consistent, and therefore clear, attitude must be expressed in the propaganda of the movement, and, moreover, it will be necessary for the propagandist reasons. Both in subject and in form, propaganda should be framed so as to reach the mass of the people; the only means of measuring its correctness is success in practice. In a larger popular assemblage, the most effective speaker is not he who appeals most to the educated section of his audience, but he who captures the hearts of the crowd.

The objective of a movement of political reform is never attained by a labored explanation, or by bringing influence to bear on the powers that be, but only by seizing political power.

But a *coup d' état* cannot be regarded as successful merely if revolutionaries take possession of the administration, but only if the success of the objects and intentions underlying such revolutionary action bring more good to the nation than they enjoyed under the preceding regime; and this cannot well be said of the German revolution, as the act of brigandage of the autumn of 1918 is called.

But of seizure of political power is the preliminary to the practical carrying-out of reforms, then a movement with reforming intentions must, from the first day of its existence, feel itself to be a movement of the people, and not a literary tea-club of a party of smug skittle players.

The young movement is in its essence and organization, anti-parliamentarian; i.e., it rejects in principle and in its composition any theory of the majority vote, implying that the leader is degraded to being merely there to carry out the orders and opinions of others. In small things and great, the movement stands for the principle of unquestioned authority of the leader, combined with fullest responsibility. It is one of the main tasks of the movement to make this principle the deciding one, not only within its own ranks, but also throughout the State.

Finally the movement does not consider it its duty to maintain or restore any particular form of State in opposition to any other one, but rather to create those fundamental principles, without which neither Republic nor Monarchy can exist in permanency. Its mission is not to found a Monarchy or to establish a Republic, but to create a Germanic State.

The question of the internal organization of the movement is not one of principle, but of expediency. The best organization is one that inserts least, and not most, machinery of State between the leaders and the individuals depending from them. For the task of organization is to communicate a definite idea – which always originates in the brain of one single man – to the general public, and also to see its conversion from theory into reality.

When the number of adherents increases, small affiliated groups are to be formed which represent local nucleus cells in the future political organization.

The internal organization of the movement should be on the following lines: Concentration at first of the whole work in one spot – Munich. A staff of adherents of undoubted reliability to be trained and a school formed for future propagation of the idea. The necessary authority to be gained for later on by means of the greatest and most visible success possible at that one centre.

Local groups are not to be formed until the authority of the central leadership in Munich has received absolute recognition.

For leadership not only will power is required, but also the capability from which energy receives greater weight than from pure genius itself. A combination of the three qualities is best of all.

The future of a movement is dependent on the fanaticism, the intolerance even, with which its adherents defend it as the one right course and carry it through in opposition to schemes of similar character.

It is a very great error to think that a movement becomes stronger by linking itself with others, though they may have similar aims. I admit that any increase of size means an increase of scope, and – in the eyes of superficial observers – of power as well; in reality, however, a movement merely admits the seed of weakness within itself, which makes itself felt later on.

The greatness of any active organization, which is the embodiment of an idea, lies in the spirit of religious fanaticism and intolerance in which it attacks all others, being fanatically convinced that it alone is right. If an idea is right in itself,

and, being armed with such weapons, wages warfare on this earth, it is invincible, and persecution only increases its internal strength.

The might of Christendom lay, not in any attempt to reconcile itself with the philosophical opinions of the ancients, which had some similarity with its own, but its unrelenting and fanatical proclamation and defense of its own doctrines.

The members of the movement must not be frightened by the hatred of the enemy of our nation and by his theories of government, or by his words; they must look for all this. Lies and calumny are essentially bound up in that hatred.

Any man who is not attacked, slandered, and calumniated in the Jewish press is no true German, no true National Socialist. The best standard for the value of his sentiments, the reality of his conviction and the strength of his will power is the ferocity shown towards him by the enemies of our nation.

The movement should use every means to instill respect for personality; it should bear in mind that all human value lies in personality, that every idea, every accomplishment, is the result of one man's creative work, and that admiration for greatness is not merely a thank offering paid to it, but also a bond uniting those who are grateful to it. There is no substitute for personality.

In the earliest days of our movement, we suffered great disabilities owing to the fact that our names carried no importance and were unknown; this by itself made any chance of success most questionable. The public, of course, knew nothing whatever about us. In Munich, no one even knew of the party by name, barring the small numbers of adherents and the few who knew them. It was, therefore, essential to extend the little circle, get fresh adherents, and at all costs get the name of the movement known.

With this in view we tried each month and later on each fortnight, to hold a meeting. The invitations were partly typed and partly written by hand on tickets. I remember myself delivering as many as eight of those tickets on one occasion, and in the evening we waited for the crowds who ought to be coming. After putting off the meeting for an hour, the chairman was obliged to start it with the original seven members, and no one else!

We poor devils subscribed little sums and finally managed to advertise a meeting in the *Münchener Beobachter*, which was then independent. This time the success was amazing.

We had taken a room for the meeting. At seven o'clock 111 persons were present and the meeting began. A Munich professor was to make the chief speech, and I was to speak second. I spoke for thirty minutes, and I now proved what I had instinctively felt, but did not know for certain in any way: I could speak. After thirty minutes, the audience in the little hall were electrified, and the enthusiasm was such that my appeal caused those present to be ready to subscribe three-hundred marks for expenses. This relieved us of a great anxiety.

The then chairman of the party Herr Harrer, was by profession and training, a journalist. But as a party leader he had one great disability. He was not an orator

for the masses. Exact and conscientious though his work was, for want of this talent perhaps, he lacked the extra driving power. Herr Drexler, then local chairman of the movement in Munich, was simply a workman and of not much account as a speaker; moreover, he was not a soldier. He had never served in the War, so that, besides being naturally weak and undecided, he had never had the sole training, which can make men out of soft undecided characters. Thus, neither of them was hewn out of timber of the kind to assimilate fanatical faith in victory for any movement.

I myself was then still a soldier.

Most of all must the Marxist betrayers of the nation have hated a movement, the outspoken aim of which was to win over the masses, which up until then had been absolutely at the beck and call of the international Marxist-Jewish stock exchange parties. The title' German Worker's Party' was an irritation by itself.

Throughout the winter of 1919-20, our one struggle was to strengthen faith in the conquering power of the young movement and swell it into the fanaticism, which has power to remove mountains.

A meeting in the Deutches Reich in the Dachauerstrasse again proved that I was right. The attendance amounted to over two hundred, and our success both financially, and as regards the public was brilliant. A month later, over four hundred came to our meetings.

It was for good reason that the young movement fixed on a definite program, and did not employ the word 'popular' (völkisch). Owing to its lack of limitation as a conception, that expression offers no possible basis for any movement, nor does it set a standard for those who are to belong to it. Since the conception is hard to define in practice and is open to broad variations of interpretation, its appeal is too wide. Introduction into the political struggle of a conception, so undefined and with so many interpretations, would tend towards destroying that community of aim in the struggle, in order to attain which it cannot be left to the individual to settle his desires and convictions for himself.

I cannot enough warn the young movement against being drawn into the net of so-called 'silent workers.' They are not only cowards, but are always incapable and idle. A man who knows of a matter, who recognizes some possible danger and sees a remedy for it before his eyes, has the obligation laid upon him not to work 'silently,' but to stand up publicly against the evil and work for its cure. If he fails in this, he is a miserable weakling, forgetful of duty, who fails either from cowardice or from laziness and incapacity. But that is how most of these 'silent workers' usually react, as though they knew God knows what. They are quite incapable, yet they try to trick the whole world with their pretensions; they are lazy, yet give an impression of vast and busy activity with their pretense of 'silent work.' In short, they are swindlers, political profiteers, who hate the honest work done by others. Every single agitator with courage to stand up to his opponents

in the tavern and defend his views boldly and frankly affects more than a thousand of such sneaking, insidious hypocrites.

Early in 1920, I urged that the first mass meeting should be held. Herr Harrer who was then chairman of the party, felt unable to agree with my views as to the moment chosen and retired in all honor from being leader of the movement. Herr Anton Drexler was his successor. I myself undertook to organize the propaganda of the movement and now proceeded to carry it on without stint.

February 24, 1920, was the date fixed upon for the first great mass meeting of the movement, which was still unknown. I made the arrangements in person. The color we chose was red, as providing the best draw, and being the one most likely to excite and irritate our opponents, and therefore to impress us most firmly on their minds and memories.

The meting started at seven-thirty. At seven-fifteen, I walked through the hall at Hofbräuhaus in the Platzl in Munich, and my heart nearly burst with joy. That great hall – for it seemed great to me then – was close-packed and overflowing with an audience of nearly two-thousand. When the first speaker had finished, it was my turn to speak. In a few minutes interruptions hailed on me, and there were violent scenes in the body of the hall; a handful of faithful War-comrades and a few other adherents engaged the disturbers and managed to restore quiet after a bit. I was able to proceed. Half an hour later, the applause began to drown the interruptions and hooting, and finally, when I had explained the twenty-five points, I had before me a hand full of people, united in a new conviction, a new faith, a new will. A fire had been kindled from the glow of which the sword was to emerge destined to restore freedom to the Germanic Siegfried and life to the German nation.

In Part II, I shall describe in detail the principles that guided us in settling our program. The so-called international classes have laughed at us and joked about us in their attempt to find fault. But the effectiveness of our program has furnished the best proof that out views at that time were the correct ones.

PART II

PART II

I

WORLD THEORY AND PARTY

IT WAS clear that the new movement could not hope to attain the importance and strength required for the great struggle unless it succeeded from the very start in planting in the hearts of its adherents, the noble conviction that it was not merely supplying political life with a new election cry, but that it presented a new view of the world.

It should be reflected what wretched motives are normally at the bottom of 'party programs' when these are polished up from time to time and remodeled. One motive there is which constantly drives the party either to introduce new programs or to alter existing ones – the anxiety about the result of the next elections.

Once the Parliamentary elections are over, the member – who is elected for five years – goes each morning to the House, not perhaps right inside, but at any rate as far as the hall in which the attendance lists are placed. His fatiguing service in the people's cause leads him to sign his name, and in return for this exhausting effort, daily repeated, he accepts a small honorarium as his well-earned reward.

There is hardly anything as depressing as to watch all that goes on in Parliament in its sober reality and to have to look on at that constantly repeated betrayal.

Such intellectual soil is not likely to produce strength in the camp of the bourgeoisie to fight the organized forces of Marxism. Indeed, gentlemen in the Parliament are not giving serious thought to it. Seeing that for all parties of so-called bourgeoisie tendency, politics actually consist wholly in the tussle for each man's seat in Parliament, in which convictions and principles are thrown overboard like sand-ballast at the requirement of the moment, their programs are naturally determined and their strength estimated – the other way around of course – in accordance with the same. They lack the great magnetic attraction to which the masses only respond under the urgent impression of great and lofty ideas and unquestioning faith combined with fanatical fighting courage.

But at a time when one side , fully armed with weapons a thousand times criminal, attacks an existing order of things, the other side can only offer resistance if it assumes a new form of faith – in our case political – and rejects a weak and timid defensive attitude in favor of bold and ruthless attack.

The conception 'popular' (völkisch) appears to be as indefinite and devoid of limitation in practice and is capable of varying interpretation as the word

'religious.' Both include certain basic beliefs. And yet, although of supreme importance, they are so vague in form that they do not rise above the value of an opinion which must more or less must be admitted, until they become fixed as the basic elements within the frame of a political party. For by mere sentiment, mankind is as incapable of converting world-ideals and the demands which arise out of them into realities as it is of winning freedom merely by a universal longing for it. No, it is not until the ideal urge towards independence adopts a fighting organization in the form of military force that the desires of a nation can be converted into noble realization.

Any world-ideal, be it a thousand times right and highly profitable to mankind, will still be without force for the life of a nation until its principles are made the basis of a fighting movement, capable of maintaining itself as a party until action is crowned by triumph and until its party dogmas become a new basic law of the State.

The ordinary attitude towards politics, current with us today, rests in general on the notion that creative and civilizing strength ought to be an attribute of the State, that the latter has no part in matters affecting race, but is a product of economic necessity or, at the best, a natural outcome of political forces. Carried to its logical conclusion, this basic attitude leads not merely to misrepresentation of racial causes, but also to failure to assign to personality its proper value. For a denial that there is a difference between races as regards their capacity for building up culture is bound to extend that great error to judgments formed concerning the personality of the individual. An assumption that all races are equal as regards character will be followed by a similar way of considering nations, and so on to individuals. Thus, international Marxism itself is merely a general view of the world – which has really been held for a very long time – carried forward by the Jew, Karl Marx in the form of a definite confession of political faith. Lacking the foundation of some such poisoning process in general operation, the extraordinary political success of those doctrines would have been impossible. Karl Marx was in reality merely the one man among millions who recognized with the sure eye of a prophet in the slough of a corrupting world the essential poison and extracted it, as if by magic arts, in a concentrated solution in order to bring quicker destruction to the independent existence of free nations on this earth. And all in order to serve his own race.

In this way, the Marxist doctrine is the intellectual epitome of the world-views generally current today

In this part of the world, human culture and civilization are inextricably bound up with the presence of the Aryan element. If it died out or went under, the black veil of a cultureless period would once again descend upon the globe.

To anyone who views the world through Nationalist eyes, any breach in the existence of human civilization, effected by the destruction of the race, which maintains it, would appear in the light of the most accursed of crimes. Whoever dares lay his hand on the most noble image of the God is sinning against the

kindly Creator of that marvel and is lending a hand in his own expulsion from Paradise.

We are all aware that in the distant future, mankind will have to deal with problems, to cope with which some most noble race will have to be summoned as master-nation, supported by the forces of the whole of the globe.

Organization of a world theory can at all times only be effected by its being enunciated definitely and distinctly; the principles of a political party which is in process of formation are the same for it as dogma is for a religion.

Therefore, the Nationalist world-theory must have an instrument forged for it that will offer a possibility of our defending it by force – just as now the Marxist Party organization is opening the way for internationalism. This is the aim, which the National Socialist German Worker's Party is pursuing.

I then perceived that it was my especial task to extract the central ideas from the mass of unshaped material of a universal world-theory and remold them in a more or less dogmatic form, which, being clearly cut and dried, should be of a kind to unite solidly all those who subscribed to it. In other words: The National Socialist German Worker's Party undertakes to adapt the essential principles of a universal national world-theory, and, having due regard to practical possibilities, the times, and the supply of human material and its weaknesses, to formulate from them a political creed which shall in time come to be the preliminary condition for the final triumph of that world-theory when once such methods have made possible a rigid organization of great masses of people.

II

THE STATE

EVEN in 1920-21, an accusation was brought against our young movement by the bourgeois world – now out of date – that our attitude towards the State was one of rejection; from this the party politicians of every color argued that it was right to fight in order to crush by every possible means the young, inconvenient champion of a new world-theory. They had forgotten purposely that the bourgeois world itself represents that the State is no longer a homogenous body, that there is and can be no consistent definition of the word. And yet in our State high schools there sit instructors in the shape of lecturers on State law, whose task it must be to find reasons and explanations for the more or less happy existence of their food-distributing centre in our mist. The worse the constitution of a State, the sillier, more high-flown, and less comprehensible are the definitions for its object in existing. How, for instance, could an Imperial-Royal professor once write about the meaning and object of the State, in a country whose State existence is the worst monstrosity of the twentieth century? A difficult task indeed!

It is possible to distinguish three groups among the German people:

First, the group of those who see the State as a more or less voluntary collection of people under a government administration. For them the mere existence of the State constitutes its claim to sanctified inviolability. In support of this mad conception of the human brain, they observe doglike adoration for 'State authority,' so-called. Thus, by a turn of the hand they convert a means into the final end. The State is not there to serve men, but men are there for the purpose of worshipping a State authority which clothes, as it were, a kind of ultimate spirit of officialdom.

The second group does not believe that State authority is the one and only object of the State, but that furtherance of its subjects' welfare has something to say in it. Thoughts of 'freedom,' wrongly understood for the most part, intrude themselves into this group's conception of the State. The fact, by itself, that the form of government exists, is not sufficient reason to consider it sacrosanct, but it must stand examination as regards suitability. We meet most of the supporters of this view among our normal German bourgeoisie, and especially among Liberal Democrats.

The third group is the weakest numerically. It sees the State as a vehicle for realizing very vaguely imagined tendencies towards a policy of force by a unified nation, all speaking the same language.

It was truly distressing to see how, during the last hundred years, people holding these opinions – in all good faith, most of them – played with the word 'Germanize.' I remember how in my own youth, this term led to amazingly false conceptions. In Pan-German circles, one heard it suggested that, with help from

the government, Germanization of the Austrian Slav population might be successfully carried out. It is hardly imaginable that anyone should think that a German could be made out of, say, a Negro or a Chinaman, because he has learned German and is ready to speak it for the rest of his life, and to vote for some German political party.

The process would mean a beginning of the bastardization of our race, and in our case not Germanization, but destruction of the German element.

Since nationality, or rather race, is not a matter of language, but of blood, it would be possible to talk about Germanization only if the process could alter the nature of the blood of the person subjected to it. That, however, is impossible. It would have to take place, then, by mixing the blood, but that would mean lowering the level of the superior race.

History shows that it was Germanization of the *land*, which our forefathers won with the sword, which brought profit, for it was colonized with German agriculturists. Whenever foreign blood has been introduced into the body of our nation, its unhappy effect has been to break up our national character.

The main principle that we must observe is that the State is not an end, but a means. It is the foundation on which higher human culture is to rest, but it does not originate it. It is rather the presence of a race endowed with capabilities for civilization that is able to do this. There might be hundreds of model States in the world, and yet, if the Aryan conserver of culture died out, there would be in existence no culture on an intellectual level with that of the highest nations of today. We may go still further and say that the fact that men form States would in no way cut out the possibility of the human race disappearing, supposing superior intellectual capacity and adaptability became lost owing to lack of a race to conserve them.

The State as such does not create a definite cultural standard; it can merely include the race that decides it. Hence, the necessary condition for producing a higher humanity is not the State, but the race that possesses the essential qualities for it.

Nations, or, better still, races possessing cultural and creative talent have these useful qualities latent in them, even though outside circumstances being unfavorable at a given moment, may prohibit development of them. Thus, it is outrageous to represent the Germanic peoples of the pre-Christian era as cultureless barbarians. That they never were. The harsh climate of their northern home forced them to exist under conditions that prevented their creative qualities from developing. If there had been no classic antique world, and if they had come to the more favorable Southern lands and had obtained the earliest technical aids to progress – that is by employing races inferior to themselves – the capacity for creating culture which was dormant in them would have produced an efflorescence just as splendid as did in fact happen in the case of the Hellenes.

The chief aim to be pursued by a national State is conservation of the ancient racial elements, which, by disseminated culture, create the beauty and dignity of

a higher humanity. We as Aryans can only picture to ourselves the State as the living organism of a nationality which will not only ensure that the nationality shall be maintained, but also, by continuing to nurture its intellectual and imaginative capabilities, will lead it onto the highest freedom.

And yet today the presence brought to bear on us as a State is a product of intense human error, with a likelihood of unspeakable misery to follow. We National Socialists are aware that the present day world regards us as revolutionaries on account of our ideas, and is branding us as such. But our thought and action must not be influenced by our own epoch's approval or condemnation, but by firm adhesion to the truths which we recognize. We may then be sure that the clearer vision of posterity will not only comprehend our action of today, but will admit that it was right, and pay honor to it.

In speaking of a higher mission of the State, we should not forget that the higher mission resides essentially in the nation, and that the State's duty is merely to make use of its organizing strength for the purpose of promoting the nation's free development.

But, if we ask how the State which we Germans require should be constituted, we must first be clear as to what kind of men it should aim at producing and what object it sets out to serve.

Unfortunately, the central kernel of our German nation is no longer racially homogenous. The process of welding the various original components together has not yet gone so far that we can assert that a new race has emerged from it. On the contrary, the poisoning through the blood from which our national body has suffered ever since the Thirty Years' War has not only upset our blood, but our soul as well. The Fatherland's open frontiers, the neighborhood of foreign non-German bodies close to our frontier lands, and above all the steady flow of foreign blood into the interior of the Reich, leave no time for absolute fusion, since the invasion continues without intermission.

Germans are without the herd instinct, which appears when all are of one blood, and protects nations against ruin, especially at moments when danger threatens. The fact of this want has done us untold harm. It provided a number of small German potentates with capitals, but it robbed the German nation of its rights of mastery.

To take the place of a dead machine, which only claims to exist for sake of itself, a living organism must be formed with the exclusive aim of serving a high conception.

In its capacity as a State, the German Reich must gather all Germans to itself; it must not only select out of the German nation only the best of the original racial elements and conserve them, but must slowly and surely raise them to a position of dominance.

It is quite natural that the officials that control our State today are much happier in working to simply keep things going as they are than in fighting for something which is to come. They feel it is easier to look on the State as a machine that is

there simply for the purpose of keeping them alive – so that their lives, as they are fond of saying, 'belong to the State.'

When, therefore, are we fighting for our new ideas – which are in full harmony with the original meaning of things – we shall draw very few comrades for the fight from a collection of men who are obsolete in body and, alas! Only too often so in mind as well. Only the exceptions, old men young in heart and fresh in mind, will come with us, but never those who think that the final significance of their task in life is to maintain a condition of things unaltered.

We must bear in mind that, if a certain sum of high energy and efficiency has been extracted from a nation and appears to be united in *one* single aim, and has been finally segregated out of the inertia of the masses, this small percentage *ipso facto* rises to become master of the rest. The world's history is made by minorities, which have incorporated in themselves the greater part of the nation's willpower and determination.

Therefore, that which appears to many to be a disadvantage is in reality the necessary condition for our victory. It is in the greatness and difficulty of our task that the probability lies that only the best fighters will join us in the fight. The pledge of success lies in choice of the very best.

Every crossing of races leads sooner or later to the decay of the hybrid product, so long as the higher portion of the cross survives united in racial purity. It is only when the last vestige of the higher racial unit becomes bastardized that the hybrid product ceases to be in danger of extinction. But a foundation must be laid of a natural, if slow, process of regeneration which shall gradually drive out the racial poison, that is, granted that a foundation stock of racial purity still exists and that the process of bastardization is arrested.

It is the first duty of a national State to raise marriage from being a perpetual disgrace to the race, and to consecrate it as an institution designed to reproduce the Creator's image and not some monstrous beings, half man, half monkey.

Protests against this on so-called humanitarian grounds ill befit an epoch which allows any corrupt degenerate to reproduce himself, and so lay a burden of unspeakable suffering both on his contemporaries and on his offspring, while, on the other hand, means for preventing a birth are offered for sale in every chemist's shop and even by street-hawkers, to parents who are perfectly healthy. In this orderly latter-day State – as those who defend it assert – in this brave world of nationalist bourgeois, prevention of fecundity in sufferers from syphilis, tuberculosis, and hereditary diseases, cripples and *cretins* counts as a crime, whereas what is in practice a cessation of fecundity in millions of our best people is not regarded as an evil or an offence against the morals of this sanctimonious society; it is instead a sop to its shortsighted slackness of thought. For if it were otherwise, they would have to rack their brains and consider how to make provision for nourishing and conserving the healthy representatives of our nation who should perform a similar service for the benefit of generations to come.

How greatly lacking in details and honor is this whole system! No one is making an effort to cultivate what is best for the sake of posterity, but things are allowed to go on just as they are going on now.

It is the duty of the national State to recover all that is being let drop now on all sides. It must put the race in the central position in the general life of the nation, and see to its being kept pure. It must declare childhood to be the most precious possession of the nation. It must see to it that only the healthy beget children – that it is not only disgraceful for persons diseased or with personal disabilities to send children into the world, but, on the contrary, an honorable action to refrain from doing so. On the other hand, it must be considered a reproach to deprive the nation of healthy children. The State must place the most modern medical aids at the service of these accepted facts. It must declare unfit to beget children anyone who is clearly diseased or has hereditary disabilities, and back up its decision with action. It must also see that the fruitfulness of a healthy woman is not blocked by the damnable régime of finance, which makes the blessing of children into a curse for the parents.

By educating the individual, the State must teach that it is not shameful, but a regrettable misfortune, to be ailing and weakly, but that it is criminal and therefore shameful to burden an innocent being with his own misfortune; whereas it is proof of high nobility of feeling and humanity worthy of admiration if a sickly but innocent man renounces having a child of his own and transfers his love and tenderness to some poor strange infant, whose healthy nature gives promise of becoming a strong member of a strong community. By this work of education the State should crown its practical activities in their intellectual aspect. Its action should go on, unaffected by consideration whether the work is understood or misunderstood, popular or unpopular.

It must be made possible for the national consciousness in the national State to bring into being a more glorious epoch in which men no longer give all of their attention to improving the breeds of horses, dogs, and cats, but rather to raising the condition of man, and in which one man silently practices renunciation with knowledge, while another person rejoices in sacrificing and giving. This ought not to be impossible in a world where hundreds of thousands of men voluntarily give themselves up to celibacy, bound by nothing but the commands of a church.

If a generation suffers under failings, which it knows of and indeed admits, and if it contents itself, as in the cause today with our bourgeois world, with lightly declaring that nothing can be done about it, such a society is doomed to destruction.

No, we just all of us refuse to give in to this deception. Our present bourgeois is now too bad and unfit to deal with any great task for humanity. It is too bad – not, in my opinion, from deliberate depravity, but from colossal indolence and all that springs from it. It is long since the political clubs, which go about under the generic name of bourgeois parties, have been anything else than societies representing certain distinct classes and professions, and they have nothing finer to do than to defend their selfish interests as best they can. It is obvious that a

guild of bourgeois politicians, such as ours, is fit for anything rather than fighting; especially when the other side consists, not of cautious shopkeepers, but of proletarian masses, violently aroused and absolutely determined.

It is the duty of the State to turn the young scions of the race into worthy instruments for increasing the race later on. With this in view the national State must direct its educational work, in the first place, not so much towards pumping in mere knowledge as towards cultivating thoroughly healthy bodies. After that comes development of mental capability. Here again formation of character comes first, especially encouragement of will-power and determination, combined with teaching the joy of assuming responsibility, and last of all comes schooling in pure knowledge.

The national State must act on the presumption that a man moderately educated, but sound in body, firm in character, and filled with joyous self-confidence and power of will, is of more value to the community, than a highly educated weakling.

Cultivation of the body is, therefore, not an affair for the individual in the national State, nor even a matter, which affects parents alone, being of second- or even third-rate interest to the community, but it is a requisite for maintenance of the race, which the State is to defend and protect. The State must also distribute its work of education that the young bodies are handled in earliest childhood and receive the hardening necessary for later life. It must take particular care that a generation of stay-at-homes is not produced.

Schools in a national State should set aside more time for bodily exercise. There should be no day on which a boy should not have at least an hour's corporal training, both in the morning and afternoon, in games and gymnastics; one sport in particular should not be omitted, which many 'nationalists' look on as rough and unworthy – boxing. It is unbelievable what false ideas are common about it among the 'educated.' They think it natural and honorable for a young man to learn how to fight and for him to fight duels, but it rough if he boxes! Why? There is no sport which encourages the spirit of attack as this one does; it demands lightning decision and hardens and supples the body. It is not rougher for two youths to settle a dispute with their fists than with a polished strip of steel.

If the whole of our intellectual class had not been exclusively trained in high-class deportment and had thoroughly learned to box instead, there would have been no German Revolution of bullies, deserters and such-like. That was only made possible because our higher school education produced not men, but rather officials, engineers, chemists, jurists, *litterateurs*, and – in order to keep this intellectuality alive – professors.

Our intellectual leadership has always produced brilliant results, but our cultivation of will power has been beneath criticism.

Our German nation, which now lies in a state of collapse, kicked at by everybody, needs the suggestive strength produced by self-confidence. This self-confidence must be cultivated in the younger members of the nation form childhood

onwards. Their whole education and training must be directed towards giving them a conviction that they are superior to others. Through bodily strength and skill the youth must recover faith in the unconquerableness of his nation. For what once led the German hosts to victory was the sum of the confidence that each individual felt in himself and all felt in their leaders. It is the conviction that freedom can once again be wrested by force, which will restore the German nation to its former elevation. But that conviction can only be the final product of a sentiment shared by millions of individuals.

Let no one make a mistake about this: Vast as was the collapse of our nation, equally vast must be the effort one day to end this unhappy condition. Only by an immense output of national will power, thirst for freedom, and passionate devotion, can we restore what has been missing in us.

It is the duty of the national State to cultivate bodily efficiency, not only during the official school years; but also, when school days are over, it must see to it that, as long as a young man is still undergoing bodily development, this development shall turn out a blessing to him. It is foolish to think that the State's right to supervise its young citizens ends suddenly with the end of their school time, only to recommence when they begin their military service. The right is a duty and is equally there at all times.

The army also is not there merely to teach a man how to march and stand at attention, but it has to act as the final and highest school of national instruction. The young recruit must, of course, learn the use of his weapon, but at the same time, he must continue his training for his future life. In that school the boy shall be transformed into a man; he shall not merely learn to obey, but shall be trained with a view to commanding at some future time.

Fortified by confidence in his own strength, filled with the *esprit de corps*, which he feels in common with the rest, the boy shall attain to the conviction that his nation is unconquerable.

When his military service is over, he must be able to show two documents: his legal papers as citizen of the State, which allows him to take his part in public affairs, and his certificate of health, stating that, as regards health, he is fit to marry.

In the case of female education, the main stress should be laid on bodily training, and after that on development of character, and, of the intellect. But the one absolute aim of female education must be with a view to the future mother.

How often in the War was the complaint not heard that our people were so little able to hold their tongues, and how difficult it was, therefore, to keep even important secrets from the enemy's knowledge! But consider for yourself: Did German education before the War ever bother to represent silence as a manly virtue? No; for our existing school system regards that as a trifling matter. But, that trifling matter costs the State untold millions in law expenses, since ninety percent of the libel cases and the like arise simply from inability to keep silence. Careless statements get cast back equally carelessly; our national trade is constantly injured by manufacturer's secrets being carelessly given away, and

any quiet preparations for defense of the country made illusory, because the people have never learned to hold their tongues, and never stop talking. In war, this passion for chattering may lose battles, and be an essential cause of a war ending badly. It ought to be realized that what is not practiced in youth cannot be learned when a man is fully grown up.

Deliberate development in our schools of the finer qualities is today nonexistent. From now on, it must be considered in quite a different light. Trustworthiness, readiness for self-sacrifice, and silence are virtues that a great nation needs, and training in them in our schools is more important than a lot of the stuff that now fills the school curriculum.

Thus, the educational work of the national State must lay great stress on formation of character side by side with cultivation of the body. Many moral defects, now inherent in the body of the nation, might by consistent training be very greatly modified, even if not entirely extirpated.

People have often complained that throughout November and December 1918, there was failure in every quarter, and that from the Monarch down to the last divisional commander, no one could summon up courage to come to any independent decision. That terrible fact is a curse of our education, for in that cruel catastrophe, there appeared on a vast scale what was universally present in minor matters. It is the lack of will power, and not lack of war material, which makes us totally incapable of serious resistance. It lies deep down in our nation, and prevents our taking any decision with a risk attached, just as if greatness in action did not consist of the daring displayed. A German general succeeded, without realizing it, in discovering a classic formula for this miserable want of decision; he said: 'I never act unless I can count on fifty-one percent of success.' This 'fifty-one percent' sums up the tragedy of the German collapse.

The present day terror of responsibility is all on the same lines. The fault is in the education of the young; it permeates all public life and finds its crown in the institution of parliamentary government.

Just as the national State must in future pay full attention to cultivation of will power and decision, it must implant in the hearts of the young from childhood onwards joy in responsibility, and courage to own up to faults.

Scientific training, which today is the be-all and end-all of all State education, can be adopted by the national State with a few alterations, which may be considered under three heads.

In the first place, the youthful brain must not be burdened with subjects, ninety percent of which it does not need and therefore forgets again. Take, for instance, an ordinary State official, who has passed out of the *Gymnasium* (public day school) or the *Oberrealschule* (higher modern school), in his thirty-sixth or fortieth year. How little he has retained of all that was crammed into him!

The system of teaching, which I indicate generally, will be quite sufficient for the majority of young people, while the others, who will need a language for instance,

later on, will be enabled to build upon it and study it exhaustively of their own free choice.

It will also provide the school day with the time necessary for bodily training and for the increased requirements in other respects, as I have already indicated.

In the methods of teaching history, especially alterations must be considered. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the results of the present day system are lamentable. A few dates, birth figures, and names, are all that remain, while the broad, clear lines are altogether absent. The essentials, which really matter, are never taught, but it is left for the more or less talented genius of the individual to discover the inner meaning of the flood of dates, and the succession of events.

In the teaching of history, reduction of the matter to be taught must be considered. For history is not studied merely to discover what happened, but in order that it may give instruction for the future and continued existence of our own nation. There should be no break away from the study of the antique. Rightly conceived on broad lines, Roman history continues to be the best instruction, not only for now, but also for all periods. It is the duty of a national State to see to it that a history of the world is eventually written in which the question of race shall occupy a predominant position.

The little account take by our school-teaching today, in the secondary schools especially, with regard to professions in after-life, is best proved by the fact that men from three quite different kinds of school can enter the same profession. What counts, therefore, is general education only, and not specialized instruction. Cases regarding specialized knowledge cannot, of course, be catered for in the curriculum of our secondary schools, as they are today.

The national State must lose no time in clearing away such imperfections.

The second alteration required by our school system is as follows: a sharp cleavage must be affected between general and specialized technical training. Since the latter threatens to sink more and more, general education, at least in its ideal conception, must continue to act as a counterweight to it. We must cling to the principle that industry and technical science and trade can flourish only as long as a national community with high ideals provides the necessary setting. By this is meant not material selfishness, but readiness for sacrifice and joy in renunciation.

Today, there is no clear definition of the State as a conception; nothing is left to be taught but local patriotism. In the old Germany, it mostly took the form of somewhat dim glorification of minute potentiates whose very numbers made any worthy appreciation of the great ones of our nation a matter of impossibility from the start. The result was that our people as a whole got a very imperfect notion of German history. It missed the main lines. It is thus obvious that no man could ever achieve any real enthusiasm for the nation in such a fashion.

No one knew how to represent the really important men of our nation to present day school children as glorious heroes, how to concentrate universal attention upon them, and so create a solid sentiment.

Since the revolution made its way into Germany and monarchical patriotism faded away of itself, the teaching of history has really pursued but one aim, that of mere acquisition of knowledge. The State, as it is now, has no use for national enthusiasm. There is but little chance for the permanent resisting power of patriotism in a republic. For there can be no possible doubt that the German people would ever have held out in the field for four and a half years if their motto had been 'For the Republic.'

This Republic is popular with the rest of the world. A weak man is always better liked by those who make use of him than a rough-mannered man. Indeed, the enemy's sympathy with this form of State is its most destructive criticism. They like the German Republic and allow it to go on, since no better ally in the work of enslaving our nation could possibly be found.

The national State will have to fight for its life. The Dawes proposals will not help it to defend itself. For its life and self-protection, it will require just what men now believe they can dispense with. The more perfect and valuable it is in form and essence, the more will its opponents resent and resist it. The citizens will then be its best protection rather than its weapons. Fortress walls will not cover it, but rather the living walls of men and women, full of love for the Fatherland and fanatic nationalist enthusiasm.

The third recommendation deals with scientific teaching: The national State will look upon science as a means for increasing national pride. Not only world history, but also the history of civilization must be taught from this point of view. An inventor should appear great, not merely as an inventor, but even more so as a fellow-countryman. Admiration of any great deed must be combined with pride, because the fortunate doer of it is a member of our own nation. We must extract the greatest from the mass of great names in German history, and place them before the youth in so impressive a fashion, that they may become the pillars of an unshakable nationalist sentiment.

There is no such thing as nationalism, which merely considers class. One can only be proud of one's nation if there is no class of which one must feel ashamed; but a nation, half of which is in misery, worn with care, or indeed corrupt, makes a picture so bad that no one can feel pride in it. Not until a nation is sound in all its parts, body and soul, can the joy of belonging to it rightly swell to that high feeling which we call 'national pride.' But this high pride will only come to a man who knows the greatness of his nation. The fear of chauvinism, which is felt in our time is the mark of its impotence.

This world is undoubtedly going through great changes. The only question is whether the outcome will be good of Aryan humanity or profits for the eternal Jew. The task of the national State will, therefore, be to preserve the race and fit it to meet the final and greatest decisions on this globe by suitable education of its youth. The nation that is first in the field will reap the victory.

From the point of view of the race, this education should be completed by service in the army; just as for ordinary Germans, the period of military service ought to count as the conclusion of normal education.

Great though the importance of bodily and mental training will be in the national State, selection of the best individuals will be equally important intrinsically. This is treated very casually today. As a rule, it is the children of better-class parents in good circumstances who are considered suited for higher training. The question of talent plays a subordinate part. Talent can really be only estimated relatively. A farmer's son may have far more talent than one of parents with many generations of high position behind them. The latter's superior knowledge may have no connection with greater or less talent, but be rooted in the essentially greater wealth of impressions received by the child as a result of his more comprehensive education, and the more varied surroundings in his life.

Knowledge obtained by cramming will not produce the inventive qualities, but only that which is inspired by talent; no one, however, in Germany attaches any value to talent today; nothing but the crying need for it will call it out.

Here is another educative task for the national State. It is not its duty to confine deciding influence in the hands of an existing class of society, but it is its duty to draw the most competent brains forward out of the total mass of the nation and promote them to place and dignity. It is the State's obligation to give certain defined education in the national school to the average child, but it must also offer talent the opportunity which it ought to enjoy. It should consider it its highest duty to open the doors of the higher State educational establishments, without distinction, to talent of every sort, in whatever class it appears.

There is a further reason why the State should give its attention to this matter. In Germany, especially, the intellectual class is so rigidly shut up in itself away from the rest of the world that it has no living ties with the classes below it. There are two ill effects from this: first, this class has neither understanding for, nor sympathy with, the mass of the people. It has been cut off from all connection with them too long for it still to possess the needful psychological comprehension of the people. It has become a stranger to them. Secondly, this upper class lacks the essential will power; for this is always weaker among the intelligentsia than in the primitive masses. God knows that we Germans have never failed in the department of knowledge, but we have failed all the more in will power and determination.

For instance, the more intellectual our statesmen were, the weaker most of them were in real accomplishment. Our political preparation for war and our technical armaments were insufficient, not because the brains governing our nation were *too little* educated, but rather because our rulers were too highly educated, stuffed with knowledge and intellect, but empty of sound instinct and utterly wanting in energy and boldness. It was our nation's sad fate to have to fight for its life under a Chancellor who was a philosophizing weakling. If we had been led by some robust man of the people, instead of a Bethmann-Hollweg, the

grenadier private's heroic blood would not have been shed in vain. Moreover, the exaggeratedly highbrow qualities of the material from which our leaders came provided the best possible allies for the scoundrels of November. By its shameful manner of choking the national welfare which was entrusted to it, instead of furthering it by might and main, that intellectually created the conditions which made the success of the other side a certainty.

The Roman Catholic Church sets an example, from which much may be learned. The celibacy of its priests obliges it to draw the succeeding generation for the priesthood, not from its own ranks, but from the mass of the people. Most people are unaware of this particular significance of celibacy. It is the foundation of the strength of that ancient institution.

It will be the duty of the national State in its educative capacity to see to it that there is perpetual renewal of the intellectual class by fresh blood from below. It is obligatory on the State to select with the utmost care, and exactitude from the whole sum of its nationals a human material with obvious natural talent, and apply it in the service of the community.

All work has a two-fold value, the purely material, and the ideal. Its material value rests in the importance of the work done, measured not so much by its material aspect, as by its essential needfulness; whereas, ideally speaking, there is equality among men from the moment that each individual in his own sphere, whatever that may be, exerts himself to do his best. The estimate of a man's value must depend on the way in which he performs the task entrusted to him by the community. For the labor of the individual is only the means, not the object, of his existence. Rather must he continue to form and ennoble himself as a man, but this can only be possible within the frame of the culture which he shares, and which must always have its foundation in some State.

But the present day is working its own ruin; it introduces universal suffrage, chatters about equal rights, and can give no reason for so thinking. In its eyes, material rewards are an expression of a man's worth, thus shattering the basis for the noblest equality that could possibly exist. For equality does never and can never rest on a man's achievements by themselves, but it is possible, granted that ever man fulfils his own special obligations. This and this only can set aside the chances of nature when a man's worth is judged, and each man forges his own significance.

It may be that gold has become the one dominant power in the life of today; but a time will come when men shall bow before higher gods. There is much today which owes its existence to the desire for money and property, but little is included in it the non-existence of which would leave mankind the poorer. It is one of the tasks of our movement to hold out prospects of a time when the individual will be given what he needs in order to live, but also to maintain the principle that man does not live for material enjoyment alone. This will find expression in a wise grading of earnings such as shall make it possible for every

honest worker to be certain of living an orderly, honorable life as a man and a citizen.

Let it not be said that this is an imaginary ideal, which this world could not stand in practice and could never actually attain. Even we are not so simple as to imagine that a faultless age can successfully be brought into being. But this does not release us from the obligation to combat the faults which are known, to abolish weaknesses and to strive for the ideal. Bitter realization will of itself produce only too many limitations. For that very reason, men must try to serve the final aim. Failures must not turn them away from their objective, just as the law cannot be spurned merely because mistakes creep into it, nor can medicine be despised because there will always be illnesses. Men should be careful not to have too low an estimate of the strength of an ideal.

III

CITIZENS AND SUBJECTS OF THE STATE

THE institution, which today is wrongly named 'the State', knows only two kinds of individual: State citizens and foreigners. State citizens are all those who either by birth or naturalization enjoy the rights of State citizenship; foreigners are those who enjoy similar rights under other states. Nowadays these rights are acquired in the first place by the fact of being born within the frontiers of a State. Race and nationality play no part in it. The child of a Negro, who once lived in a German protectorate and now is domiciled in Germany, is automatically a citizen of the German State. The whole procedure of acquiring State citizenship is not very different from that of becoming a member of an automobile club, for instance.

I know that this is unwelcome to hear; but anything crazier and less thought out than our present laws of State citizenship is hardly possible to conceive. But there is at least one State in which feeble attempts to achieve a better arrangement are apparent. I, of course, do not mean our pattern German Republic, but the United States of America, where they are trying, partially at any rate, to include common sense in their councils. They refuse to allow immigration of elements, which are bad from the health point of view, and absolutely forbid naturalization of certain defined races, and thus are making a modest start in the direction of something not unlike the conception of the national State.

The national State divides its inhabitants into three classes: State citizens, State subjects, and foreigners. In principle, birth only gives the status of a subject. This does not with it carry the right to serve yet as a State official, nor to take active part in politics in the sense of voting at elections. In the case of every State subject, race and nationality have to be proved. The subject is free at any time to cease being a subject, and become a citizen in the country corresponding with his nationality. The foreigner is only different from the subject in that he is a subject of a foreign State.

The young subject of German nationality is bound to undergo the school education, which is laid down for every German. Later on, he must consent to undergo the bodily exercises, as laid down by the State, and finally he enters the army. Military training is universal. After his military service is over, the healthy young man with a blameless record will be solemnly invested with the rights of State citizenship. This is the most important document for his whole life on earth. It must be held in greater honor to be a citizen of this Reich, even if only a crossing-sweeper, than to be a king in a foreign State.

The German girl is a State subject, but marriage makes her a citizen. But a German woman engaged in business, may be granted rights of citizenship.

IV

PERSONALITY AND THE CONCEPTION OF THE NATIONAL STATE

IT WOULD be folly to expect to measure a man's worth by the race he belongs to, and at the same time to declare war on the Marxist axiom, One man is the same as any other,' unless we were prepared to pursue it to its final consequences.

Anyone who believes today that a national, National-Socialist State should, by purely mechanical means and better construction of its economic life, make itself different from other States – that is, by a better compromise between riches and poverty, or by broadening the control of the economic process, or by fairer recompense, by doing away with too great differences in wages – will find himself in an absolute *impasse*: he has not the slightest conception of what we mean by a world-view. The methods described above offer no hope of permanency; still less do they promise a great future. A nation which puts trust in reforms so superficial, will obtain no guarantee whatever of victory in the general struggle of nations. A movement which founds its missions on such compromises, as these will in truth introduce no great reforms, real because far-reaching, because its action will never touch anything but the surface of things.

In order to understand this more clearly, it may be well to glance at the real origins and causes of the development of human civilization.

The first step, which visibly drew mankind away from the animal world was that which led towards invention. Man's first skilled measures in the struggle with the rest of the animals were in their origin undoubtedly his management of creatures, which had special capabilities. Even then, personality was what clearly produced decisions and achievements, which were later on accepted by the whole of humanity as a matter of course. A man's knowledge of his own powers, which I consider even now is the foundation of all strategy, was due originally to a determined brain, and not until perhaps thousands of years had passed, was it universally accepted as a purely natural thing.

Man crowned his first discovery with a second: he learned, among other things, how to live while engaged in his struggle for life. And so began the inventive activity peculiar to man, the results of which we see all around us. And it is the result of the creative power and the capability of the individual person. It was profoundly instrumental in making the man of who has the power of continually rising still. But what were once simple artifices, helping hunters in the forest, in their struggle for existence, are now the brilliant scientific discoveries of our present time, and these help mankind in the struggle for existence today, and are forging the weapons for struggles in the future.

The labor of evolving pure theory, which is incapable of measurement, but which is the necessary preliminary for all further material discovery, is again seen to be

the exclusive product of the individual. The multitude does not invent, majorities neither organize nor think; it is always only the one man, the Individual.

A human community is only seen to be well organized if it furthers in every possible way the work of these creative forces and employs them for the good of the community. Organization must be the embodiment of the endeavor to place the brains over the multitude, and to subjugate the multitude to the brains.

Thus, organization may not prevent the brains from emerging from the multitude, but it must, on the contrary, by its own conscious action, make it in the highest degree possible and facilitate it.

The hard fight for life above all things causes the brains to emerge.

State administration and the strength of the nations incorporated in the defense forces are dominated by the idea of personality and the authority attaching to it and by responsibility towards the highly placed individual.

The political life of today alone has persistently turned its back on this principle of nature. While all human civilization is but the outcome of the creative force of personality, in the community as a whole and especially among its leaders, the principle of the dignity of the majority makes a pretense of being the deciding authority, and it is beginning gradually to poison all life below it – and in fact to break it up. The destructive workings of Judaism in the bodies of other nations can at bottom only be ascribed to the perpetual effort to undermine the importance of personality throughout the nations who are their hosts, and to substitute the will of the multitude.

We now see that Marxism is the enunciated form of the Jewish attempt to abolish the importance of personality in all departments of human life, and to set the mass of numbers in its place. In politics, the parliamentary form of government is its expression, and that is what is working such mischief, from the smallest parish council, up to the power controlling the entire Reich.

Marxism has never been able to found a culture or create an economic system by itself; moreover, it has never really been in a position to carry on an existing system in accordance with its own principles. But after a very short time it was forced to retrace its steps, and grant concessions to the theory of the principle of personality; even in its own organization, it is unable to deny that principle. The national theory of the world must therefore be completely differentiated from the Marxist theory; it must pin its faith on race and on the importance of personality also, and make them the pillars supporting the whole of its edifice. These are the basic factors of its view of the world.

The national State must work untiringly, to set all government, especially the highest – that is, the political leadership – free from the principle of control by majorities – that is, the multitude – so as to secure the undisputed authority of the Individual in its stead.

The best form of State and constitution is that which with natural sureness of hand raises the best brains of the community to a position of leadership and predominant influence.

There must be no majority making decisions, but merely a body of responsible persons, and the word 'council' will revert to its ancient meaning. Every man shall have councilors at his side, but the *decision* shall be made by one Man. The national State does not suffer that men whose education and occupation have not given them special knowledge shall be invited to advise on or judge of subjects of a specialized nature, such as economics. The State will therefore subdivide its representative body into political committees and committees representing professions and trades. In order to obtain advantageous cooperation between the two, there will be over them, a particular Senate.

But neither Senate nor Chamber will have power to make decisions. Individual members may advise, but never decide. That is the exclusive prerogative of the responsible President for the time being.

As regards the possibility of carrying out our knowledge in practice, I may remind my readers that the parliamentary principle of decision by majorities has not always governed the human race; on the contrary, it only appears during quite short periods of history, and those have always been periods of decadence in nations and States.

In any case, let no one imagine that purely theoretical measures from the above will produce such a change since logically it cannot stop at the constitution of a State. All legislation and, indeed, the citizen's whole life will have to be saturated with it. Such a revolution will and can only come about by means of a movement, itself built up in the spirit of that idea and therefore itself the begetter of the coming State.

Thus, the National-Socialist movement must today identify itself with that idea and carry it out in practice within its own organization, so that it may not only be able to guide the State in the right path, but may have the perfected body of the State ready for its occupation.

V

WORLD THEORY AND ORGANIZATION

THE national State, of which I have attempted to draw a general picture, will not be brought into being by the mere knowledge of the requirements of that State. It is not enough to know what such a State ought to look like. The problem of its birth is a far more important one. We cannot wait until the present parties, which draw their profits from the State as it is, change their attitude of their own initiative. This is all the less possible, since their real leaders are Jews and Jews only.

The Jew pursues his object irresistibly in his dealings with the millions of German bourgeois and proletarians who are sliding along to destruction chiefly owing to their indolent stupidity and timidity. The Jew is fully conscious of his final aim. A party led by him has no choice but to fight for his interests and has nothing in common with the character of Aryan nations.

Thus, if an attempt has been made to realize the ideal of a national State, we shall have to ignore the forces now controlling the life of the public and seek for another force, determined and able to take up the struggle for that ideal. For there is a struggle ahead of us, if our first task is not creation of a new conception of a State, but removal of the present Jewish conception.

The first weapon of a young doctrine containing new and great principles must, however much individuals may dislike it, be the probe of sharp criticism.

Marxism possessed an objective and is aware of constructive ambition (even if this is merely erection of a despotism of Jewish world-finance); but it nevertheless gave itself up to shattering criticism for a whole seventy years. Then began its so-called 'constructive work.' This was perfectly right, natural, and logical.

A world-theory is intolerant, and is not content with being one party among a number of other parties; is insists upon exclusive and persistent recognition of itself and on an absolutely new conception of the whole of public life in accordance with its views. Thus, it cannot tolerate continuance of a force representing the former conditions.

It is the same with religions. Christianity was not content with merely erecting its own altar; it was forced to proceed to destroy the altars of the heathen. Such fanatical intolerance alone made it possible to build up that adamantine creed; it is an absolutely essential condition of its existence.

Political parties are always ready to compromise; world-theories never are. Political parties bargain with their opponents; world-theories claim that they themselves are infallible.

Even political parties almost always at first cherish a hope of rising to despotic authority; they nearly always contain some little trace of a world-theory. But the

poverty of their program robs them of the heroism, which is demanded by a world-theory. Their readiness to conciliate attracts to them the petty weak spirits with whom no crusade can be conducted. So they usually stick fast early in their history in the slough of their own miserable pettiness.

A world-theory can never be victorious with its ideals, unless it unites in its ranks the boldest and strongest elements of its age and nation and forms them into a solid fighting organization. It is also essential for it to extract certain definite ideas out of the general world-picture, and present them in a concise, striking form, suitable to serve as a creed for a new community of mankind. Whereas the program of a party, which is merely political, is the recipe for getting good results from a forthcoming election, that of a world-theory is equivalent to a declaration of war on the existing order of things; in fact, against an accepted view of life.

It is not necessary for every single fighter to be granted full insight into and exact knowledge of the latest ideas and mental processes of the leaders of the movement. An army would not be much good if all of the fighting men were generals, and a political movement would not be much good in defending a world-theory, if it consisted merely of a collection of 'intellectuals.' No, it needs the primitive fighting man as well. For there can be no internal discipline without him.

By its very nature an organization cannot stand unless leaders of high intellect are served by a large mass of men inspired by sentiment. It would be harder to maintain discipline on a company of two hundred men, all equally gifted intellectually, than in one containing one hundred and ninety less gifted, and ten with higher intellects.

The organization of Social Democracy is a case in point; its army consists of officers and men. The German worker, disbanded from the army, is the private soldier; the Jewish intellectual is the officer.

In order that the national idea may emerge out of the vague desire of the present day and succeed in producing clear thought, it must select certain definite leading sentences from the mass of broad conceptions. With this in view, the program of the new movement was drawn up in the form of a number of leading sentences, twenty-five in all. Their object is first to give the man in the street a rough picture of the intentions of the movement. To some extent, they are a confession of political faith, partly for the advantage of the cause, and partly with the purpose of binding and fusing together its members by an engagement recognized in common by all.

By our policy of declaring on broad lines a doctrine, which is sound in principle, we consider that it is less harmful to cling to a conception, even if it does not altogether fit actual realities, than, by trying to improve it, to lay open to discussion some basic law of the movement which has hitherto counted as unalterable, since most evil consequences might follow; in fact, it cannot be done while a movement is fighting for victory. What is essential must be sought, not in externals, but in the inner sense; and in that there is nothing to be changed. We

can only hope that in its own interests, the movement will retain the strength needed for its battles by avoiding any action showing evidence of divisions and lack of solidarity.

Much may be learned from the Roman Catholic Church. Though the body of its doctrine clashes with exact science and research on many points – unnecessarily in many respects – the Church is not prepared to sacrifice a single syllable of its doctrines. It has realized very correctly that its power of resistance depends, not on being more or less in harmony with the scientific events of the moment – which are as a matter of fact always altering – but rather on clinging firmly to dogmas, once laid down, which on the whole do express the character of the faith. As a consequence, the Church stands firmer than ever before.

With its program of twenty-five theses, the National Socialist German Workers' Party accepted a basis, which must be unshakable. Now and in the future, it is and will be the task of the members of our movement, not to criticize and alter those leading principles, but to regard themselves as bound to insist upon them.

In its youth, the young movement owed its name to them and the program of the party was drawn up in accordance with them.

The basic ideas of the National Socialist movement are nationalist, and in an equal degree, nationalist ideas are National Socialist; if National Socialism is to be victorious, it must adhere absolutely and exclusively to that conviction. It is its duty no less than its right to proclaim the fact most definitely that any attempt to represent the nationalist idea outside of the limits of the National Socialist German Workers' Party is inadmissible, and at in the majority of cases, it rests on a false foundation.

All kinds of associations and cliques, little groups and 'great parties' as well, claim for themselves the word 'nationalist'; this in itself is but one effect of the influence of the National-Socialist movement. But for it, it would never have occurred to all these organizations even to mention the word 'nationalist'; it would have suggested no meaning to them, and they, and, in particular, their leaders would have had nothing whatsoever to do with the conception. The N.S.G.W.P. (N.S.D.A.P.) was the first to attach a meaning to that word, which contains so much and which is now in common use by every sort of person. Our movement has proved out and out in its propaganda work the strength of the nationalist idea, so that greed of advantage is forcing the others at least to pretend to similar aspirations.

VI

THE STRUGGLE IN THE EARLY DAYS
THE RÔLE OF THE ORATOR

WE had hardly finished with the first great meeting of February 24, 1920, in the Hofbräuhausfestsaal at Munich when preparations for the next one were under way. Hitherto we had not dared to think of holding a meeting once a fortnight or even once a month in a city such as Munich, but now a large one was to be arranged for each week.

At that time, the hall held an almost sacred meaning for us National Socialists. It was better filled each time, and the people were more and more attentive. The proceedings nearly always started with the subject of 'War Guilt,' about which nobody then bothered, and went on to the peace treaties; violent methods of speech were found suitable and indeed necessary. In those days, if a public mass meeting, at which not phlegmatic bourgeois, but harried proletarians were present, dealt with the Versailles Treaty, it meant an attack on the Republic and was held to be a sign of reactionary, if not monarchist, feeling. The moment Versailles was criticized, there would regularly be interruptions: 'And Brest-Litovsk?' The crowd would continue to shout until it gradually got more heated, or the speaker gave up trying to persuade them. We felt inclined to dash our heads against the wall at despair at such a set of people! They would not understand that Versailles was a shame and a disgrace, or that, that dictated peace was a frightful plundering of our nation. The Marxist work of destruction and the enemy's poison propaganda had made these people blind to all reason. And yet, no one might complain; for how immeasurably great was the guilt of the other side! What had the bourgeoisie done to stem this terrible disintegration, or by better and more intelligent handling to pave the way for truth? Nothing whatever!

I, myself saw clearly that, as far as the movement, then in its infancy, was concerned, the question of war guilt must be cleared up on the lines of historical truth.

There is naturally much temptation, especially for any weak movement, to act and shout with the crowd at moments when a strong opponent has succeeded in deceiving and driving the people to come to some lunatic decision, particularly if it contains a few points – even if illusory – in favor of doing so, from the point of view of that young movement.

I have experienced such cases on several occasions, when the utmost energy was required to prevent the ship from drifting in the general current, started by artificial means, or indeed driving along with it. The last occasion was when our fiendish press, the Hecuba of the German nation's life, succeeded in giving the South Tyrol question a prominence, which will have serious consequences for the German nation. Without considering what cause they were serving, several so-called 'nationalist' men, parties, and societies, joined in the cry, simply from fear of the public feeling excited by the Jews, and foolishly gave their support in a

struggle against a system, which we Germans ought, especially just at the present crisis, to regard as the one bright spot in this corrupt world. While the international world-Jew, is slowly but surely strangling us, our so-called 'patriots' are raging against the Man and a System that have had the courage to tear themselves free, in one bit of the world at least, from the Jew Freemason embrace, and to oppose the international world poison with the forces of nationalism.

It soon became evident that our opponents, especially when debating with us, were armed with a definite repertoire of arguments and that their points against our claims kept constantly recurring in their speeches; this similarity pointed to conscious and unified training. And so it was a fact. Today I am proud of having discovered the means not only of making their propaganda ineffectual, but also of beating the framers of it with their own words. Two years later, I was a master of this craft.

Whenever I spoke, it was important to get a clear idea beforehand of the probable form and character of the arguments we had to expect during the discussion, and then to tear them to pieces in my own opening speech; the thing was to mention all the possible arguments *contra* at once, and prove their hollowness.

This was the reason why, after my first lecture on the Versailles Peace Treaty, which I delivered to the troops in my capacity as lecturer to them, I made an alteration and now spoke on the 'Peace Treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Versailles.' For I quickly ascertained, in the discussion following my lecture, that the men really knew nothing whatever about the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, but that it was due to the successful propaganda of their parties and that they imagined that treaty as one of the most shameful acts of oppression in the world. The persistency with which this lie was put before the public was the reason that millions of Germans regarded the Versailles Treaty as nothing more than a just retribution for the crime we committed at Brest-Litovsk. And therefore, they considered any real struggle against Versailles would be wrong, and in many cases, there was genuine moral dislike of such a proceeding. That was the reason why the shameless and monstrous word 'reparations' was able to find a home in Germany. In my lectures, I put the two peace treaties together, compared them point-by-point, and demonstrated how truly and immensely humane the one was in contradistinction to the inhuman cruelty of the other, the result was most remarkable. Once more, a great lie was expunged from the hearts and brains of audiences amounting to thousands, and a truth was planted in place of it.

These meetings brought profit to me, in that I slowly became an orator at mass meetings and that the pathos and gesture required in large halls holding a thousand people became a matter of second nature to me.

Our first meetings were distinguished by the fact that there were table covered with leaflets, papers, and pamphlets of every kind, but we relied chiefly on the spoken word. And in fact, the latter is the sole force capable of producing really great revolutions of sentiment, for reasons which are psychological.

An orator receives continuous guidance from his audience, enabling him to correct his lecture, since he can measure all the time on the countenances of his listeners the extent to which they are successful in following his arguments intelligently, and whether his words are producing the effect he desires, whereas the writer has no acquaintance with his readers. Hence, he is unable to prepare his sentences with a view to addressing a definite crowd of people, sitting in front of his eyes, but he is obliged to argue in general terms.

Supposing that an orator observes that his listeners do not understand him, he will make his explanation so elementary and clear that every single one must take it in. If he feels that they are incapable of following him, he will build up his ideas carefully and slowly until the weakest member has caught up; again when once he senses that they do not seem to be convinced that he is correct in his argument, he will repeat them over and over again, with fresh illustrations, and himself state their unspoken objections; he will continue thus, until the last group of the opposition show him by their behavior and play of expression that they have capitulated to his demonstration of the case.

Not infrequently, it is a case of overcoming the prejudices, which do not come from their understanding, but are mainly unconscious and supported by sentiment. It is a thousand times more difficult to overcome this barrier of instinctive repulsion, sentimental hatred, and negative bias, than to set straight opinions founded on incorrect or mistaken knowledge. Ignorance and false conceptions may be removed by teaching – obstruction due to sentiment never can.

The force, which gave Marxism its amazing power over the masses, is not the formal written work prepared by Jewish intellectuals, but rather the vast flood of oratorical propaganda which has dominated the masses in the course of years; out of a hundred thousand German workers, not more than a hundred known Marx's book, which was studied by a thousand times more of the intellectual class – especially by Jews – than by genuine adherents of the movement in the lower grades. That book was not written for the masses, but exclusively for the intellectual leaders of the Jewish machine for conquering the world; the agitation was conducted with very different material. This is what marks the difference between the Marxist and our bourgeois press. The Marxist press was written by agitators, while the bourgeois press preferred to conduct agitation through its writers.

Every hour of the day at which an address is delivered has a deciding influence on the effect of the address. The same address delivered by the same speaker on the same subject, has quite a different effect at ten o'clock in the morning from what it has at three in the afternoon or in the evening. When I was beginning, I arranged for meetings to be held in the morning, and remember one meeting in particular, held in the Münchener Kindl-Keller at ten o'clock to protest against 'oppression of German districts.' The result was depressing, but at the same

time, very instructive. I do not think that I had spoken any different from usual, the effect, however, was apparently just nil. I left the meeting thoroughly dissatisfied, if richer in experience. I tried the same experiment later on with the same result. Fine oratory by a dominant apostolic character will be more successful in the evening in inducing men, whose powers of resistance are by that late house sensibly weakened in the natural course, than by men who are in full possession of their energy of mind and volition.

The same purpose is served by the artificially produced dim light in Roman Catholic Churches, the lighted candles, incense, and censers.

It is all one with the silly ignorance of the world shown by our German intelligentsia that they believe that a writer is bound to be an orator's superior in intellect. This view is most delightfully illustrated in an article in a certain Nationalist paper, in which it is stated that one is so often disillusioned on seeing in print a speech by some admittedly great orator. I recollect another article, which came into my hands during the War; it seized on the speeches of Lloyd George, then Minister of Munitions, examined them as under a microscope, only to come to the brilliant conclusion that those speeches showed inferiority of intellect and knowledge, and were otherwise banal and commonplace. I obtained some of those speeches obtained in a small volume, and had to laugh out loud at the thought that an ordinary German quill-driver failed to see the point of those psychological masterpieces in the way of influencing the public. The fellow judged the speeches solely by the impression they made on his *blasé* intellect, Whereas the great English demagogue had been able by their aid to produce an immense effect on his audiences, and in the widest sense, on the whole of the British lower classes. From this point of view, that Englishman's speeches were most wonderful achievements, for they evinced amazing knowledge of the mentality of the populace; their penetrative effect was decisive in the truest sense.

Compare them with the futile stutterings of Bethmann-Hollweg, whose speeches may have been more intellectual, but really, they merely proved the man's inability to speak to his nation. Lloyd George proved his equality, nay, his immeasurable superiority to Bethmann-Hollweg by the fact that the form and the expression of his speeches were such as to open the hearts of his people to him, and to make them pay active obedience to his will. The very primitiveness of those speeches, their form of expression and his choice of easily understood, simple illustration, are proofs of that Englishman's towering political capacity.

Mass assemblies are necessary because, while attending them, the individual who feels on the point of joining a young movement, and takes alarm if left by himself, receives his first impression of a larger community, and this has a strengthening and encouraging effect on most people. He submits himself to the magic influence of what we call 'mass-suggestion.' The desires, longings, and indeed the strength of thousands are accumulated in the mind of each individual present. A man who enters such a meeting in doubt and hesitation, leaves it inwardly fortified; he has become a member of the community. The National-Socialist Movement may never ignore this.

VII

THE STRUGGLE WITH THE RED FORCES

In 1919- 20 and also in 1921, I attended so-called bourgeois meetings in person. I got to know something about those prophets of the bourgeois view of the world, and really did not wonder, for I understood why they attached so little importance to the spoken word. I attended meetings of the Democrats, German Nationalists, the German Workers' Party, and the Bavarian People's Party (Bavarian Centre Party). What struck me at once was the solid unanimity of the audiences. Nearly all who took part in such demonstrations were party followers. There was no discipline, and taken together, it was more like a bored card-party than an assembly of people who had just put through a great revolution. The speakers did all they could to keep up this peaceful atmosphere. They claimed, or, better still, most of them read speeches in the style of a clever newspaper article, or a learned treatise, avoiding all strong expressions; here and there a feeble professional joke would be introduced, at which the gentlemen on the platform dutifully guffawed – not loudly, but encouragingly, with gentlemanly reserve. The entire audience dozed in a sort of trance after three quarters of an hour of it, with interruptions caused by someone leaving; a waitress's clatter, or yawns from many in the audience. At the close, the chairman called for a German patriotic song. On this, the meeting faded out – that it, everyone hurried to get out, one to his beer, another to a café, and others simply into the fresh air.

The National-Socialist meetings, on the other hand, were by no means 'peaceable' meetings. The billows of two world-views raged against one another, and they did not finish by grinding out a dull patriotic song, but with fanatical outbreaks of popular and nationalist passion.

It was important from the start to introduce blind discipline into our meetings and establish absolutely the chairman's authority.

And we had dissentients at our meetings – followers of the Red Flag. They came often, and often in solid masses, with a few agitators among them, and on every face one could read: 'We mean to have it out with you tonight!' Often, everything hung on a thread, and only the chairman's energy and rough handling by our hall guard baffled our adversaries intentions.

The latter had every reason to be annoyed with us. We chose red for our posters after exact and careful consideration; our intention was to irritate the Left, get them into a rage, and so induce them to come to our meetings – if only in order to break them up – so that we could get a chance of talking to them.

Our opponents then proceeded to issue appeals to the 'class-conscious proletariat' to go in masses to our meetings in order to strike at the 'monarchist, reactionary agitation,' as represented by us, with the fist of the proletariat.

Our meetings were at once crammed with workmen three quarters of an hour before the time of the meeting. They resembled a powder-cask, ready to go off at any moment with the match at the touchhole. But things always happened

otherwise. The people came as enemies and went away, not perhaps prepared to join us, but anyhow in a reflective mood, and ready to criticize and examine the correctness of their doctrines. Then the word went out: 'Proletarians! Avoid the meetings of the Nationalist agitators!' Similar vacillating tactics were observable in the Red press as well.

The people became curious. There was a sudden change of tactics, and for a period, we were treated as true criminals against mankind. Article after article proclaiming and demonstrating our criminality, and scandalous tales fabricated from A to Z were meant to do the trick. But in a short time they seem to have convinced themselves that such attacks were having no effect; in fact, it really helped to concentrate general attention straight on us.

One reason it never got as far as breaking up our meetings was indubitably the extraordinary cowardice displayed by our opponents' leaders. At all critical moments, these despicable creatures waited outside the halls for the result of the explosion.

At that time, we were obliged to take the protection of our meetings into our own hands; one can never count upon protection by the official authorities; on the contrary, experience shows that they always favor the disturbing element. For the only real success attending official action was at most in dissolving a meeting – that is, stopping it altogether; this was, in fact, the aim and object of our opponents in coming to disturb us. Thus, we had to make up our minds that any meeting, which depended for protection solely on the police, brings discredit on its promoters in the eyes of the masses. Often and often, a handful of adherents had put up a heroic resistance against a raging and violent mob of Reds. Those fifteen or twenty men would have certainly been overwhelmed in the end. But the rest well knew three or four times as many of them would first get their heads knocked in, and they were not going to risk that.

It was clear to anyone how the Revolution was only possible thanks to the devastating methods of the bourgeois who governed our nation. Even then, there would have been plenty of fists ready to protect the German nation, but there were no craniums to crack. How often then did the eyes of my young men shine in response when I explained to them the essentialness of their mission and assured them without cease that all the wisdom of this earth is as nothing unless served, covered, and protected by force, that the mild goddess of peace cannot move unless accompanied by the god of war, and that ever great act of peace must be protected and helped by force. In this way, the idea of military service came to them in a far more living form – not in the petrified sense of the souls of superannuated officials serving the dead authority of a dead State, but in the living realization of the duty of each man to offer his life that his nation might live, at all times, and everywhere.

How those young men came up to scratch!

Like a swarm of hornets, they rushed forth upon the disturbers of our meetings, regardless of superiority of numbers however great, careless of wounds and bloody sacrifice, filled to the brim with the great idea, the sacred mission to clear

the way for our movement. As early as the summer of 1920, the troops for maintenance of our order were gradually assuming definite form, and by the spring of 1921, they were divided by rank into companies, which again were divided into smaller sections. This had become urgently necessary, since in the meantime, our activities as regards meetings had been continuously increasing.

The organization of our bodies of men for keeping order at meetings was the means of clearing up a very difficult question. Up until then, the movement had possessed no party token and no flag. The lack of these symbols was not only a disadvantage then, but it was intolerable in view of the future, since members of the party had no distinctive token of membership, and for the future, it was intolerable to be without some token in the nature of a symbol of the movement, which might be set against that of the Internationalists.

More than once in my youth, the psychological importance of such a symbol had been clearly evident to me from the point of view of sentiment. In Berlin, after the War, I was present at a mass demonstration of Marxism in front of the Royal Palace. A sea of red flags, red scarves, and red flowers, gave an outward appearance of power to that crowd, which I estimated at about 120,000 persons. I felt and understood how easily the man in the street is impressed by the suggestive magic of such a grandiose piece of play-acting.

The bourgeoisie, which as a party represents no world-theory, had therefore no banner. Their party consisted of 'patriots,' and went about in the colors of the Reich.

The black-white-red of the old Empire were revived by our so-called 'national bourgeois' parties as their colors.

It is obvious that the symbol of a situation, which might be defeated by Marxism under inglorious accompanying circumstances, was worthless to serve as the token under which that same Marxism was to be crushed in its turn. However much any decent German must love and revere those old colors, glorious when placed side by side in their youthful freshness, when he had fought under them and seen the sacrifice of so many lives, that flag had little value for the struggles of the future.

This was the reason why we National Socialists recognized that to hoist the old standard would betoken no symbol, which could express our special aims; for we had no wish to raise from the dead the ruined Empire with all of its blemishes, but to build up a new State. The movement, which today is fighting Marxism in this sense, must bear on its banners the symbol of the new State. I, myself was always for keeping the old colors. After innumerable trials, I settled upon a final form: a flag having a red background, with a white disc in it, bearing on its center a black hooked cross. After much searching, I decided upon the proper proportions between the size of the flag and that of the white disc, and the form and thickness of the cross; and it has remained so ever since.

Armbands, also of the same, were at once ordered for the men of the bodies for keeping order – red with a white disc and a hooked cross in it. The new flag

first appeared in public in the middle of the summer of 1920. Two years alter, when our men, who had long numbered several thousands, were now a considerable storm-detachment (*Sturmabteilung*), It appeared necessary to give the fighting organization of the new world-theory a special symbol of victory – a standard.

At that time in Munich, there was no party, barring the Marxist parties, especially no nationalist one, which could show mass demonstrations such as we could. The Münchener Kindl-Keller, which held five thousand people, was more than once full to bursting, and there was only one hall into which we had not ventured, and that was the Circus Krone.

At the end of January 1921, there was again much cause for anxiety in Germany. The Paris Agreement, by which Germany engaged to pay the absurd sum of two-hundred and twenty-six billions of gold marks, was to be confirmed in the form of the London ultimatum.

Day after day went by, and none of the great parties had taken any notice of the frightful event, and the Community of National Organization, could not make up its mind as to a definite date for a demonstration that was being planned.

On Tuesday, February 1, I demanded a final decision. I was put off until Wednesday. On that day, I demanded to be told clearly, if and when the meeting was to take place. The reply was still uncertain and hesitating; it was that it intended to invite the organizations of the community to a demonstration on that day of the week.

Then I lost all patience, and decided to conduct a demonstration of protest on my own responsibility. By midday on Wednesday, I had dictated the posters in ten minutes, and had hired the Circus Krone for the following day, February 3rd.

In those days, it was a tremendous venture. It was quite uncertain if we could fill that vast hall, and there was a risk of the meeting being broken up. One thing was certain – a failure would throw us back for a long time to come.

We had one day in which to post our bills. Unluckily, it rained on Thursday morning, and there was reason to fear that many people would prefer remaining at home rather than hurrying to a meeting in rain and snow, especially when there was likely to be violence and murder.

On Thursday, two lorries which I hired were covered in red as much as possible, and two flags were stuck on them; each one carried fifteen or twenty members of our party; orders were given to drive fast through the streets, throwing out leaflets – propaganda for the mass meeting to be held in the evening. It was the first time that lorries with flags had driven through the streets containing others than Marxists.

When I entered the great hall, I felt the same joy, which I had felt a year previously at the first meeting in the Hofbräuhausfestsaal; but it was not until I had forced my way through the solid wall of men and had climbed onto the platform, that I had perceived the full measure of our success. The hall was before me, packed with thousands and thousands of people. My theme was 'Future or Ruin.' I began to speak and spoke for about two and a half hours. My feeling told me after the first half hour that the meeting was going to be a big

success and it was. The bourgeois papers reported the demonstration as having been merely 'nationalist' in character; in their usual modest fashion, they omitted all mention of its promoters.

After this beginning in 1921, our meetings in Munich became much more frequent. I took to having them not merely once a week, but sometimes two mass meetings in a week; in fact at mid-summer and in the late autumn, there were apt to be three. We always met now in the Circus Krone, and ascertained to our satisfaction, that all of our evenings were equally successful. The result was a constant increase in the membership of the movement.

Our adversaries were naturally not going to sit down under such successes. So they decided to make one last effort, by an act of terrorism, to put a final spoke in the wheel of our meetings. The day of action arrived a few days later. A meeting in the Hofbräuhausfestsaal, at which I was to speak, was chosen for the final reckoning. Between six and seven in the evening of November 4th, 1921, I received the first certain news that the meeting was to be definitely broken up. Owing to an unlucky chance, we had not understood about it earlier. That very day, we had moved out of our glorious old offices in the Sterneckergasse into others; that is, we were out of the old, but were not yet in the new offices, because work was still going on in them. The result was that there was only a very feeble body of men to keep order in the meeting; nothing but a weak company of about forty-six men was on hand; and the alarm apparatus was not yet in a condition to call up sufficient reinforcements in the course of a single hour.

I entered the vestibule of the hall at a quarter to eight, and saw that there was no doubt whatsoever of the immediate intention. The hall was packed and the police were stopping any more from entering. Our enemies, who had arrived very early, were inside the hall and our friends were outside. The little body of guards were waiting for me in the vestibule. I had the door into the large hall shut, and called the forty-five or forty-six men up to me. I explained to the young fellows that tonight for the very first time the movement would have to prove its faithfulness to the point of bending and breaking, and that none of us might leave the hall alive; but I did not think any of them would desert me. If I saw any man showing himself a coward, I should myself, tear his armband off him, and take away his badge. I then called upon them to go forward at once at the first sigh of an attempt to break up the meeting, and to remember that a man defends himself best by attacking.

I was answered by three cheers, which sounded fiercer and hotter than ever before. Then I entered the hall and observed the situation with my own eyes. They sat tight together and tried to stab me with their looks. Numberless faces were turned on me with seething hatred, while others uttered yells which meant but one thing. They knew they were the stronger party and felt accordingly.

It was, however, possible to begin the meeting, and I began to speak. After about an hour and a half, the signal was given. A few angry cries and a man suddenly leaped onto a chair and yelled 'Liberty!' Upon which the fighters for 'liberty' began their work. In a few seconds, the hall was filled with a yelling and

howling mob, above which numberless pint-pots flew like howitzer shells: Chair legs smashed, glass slivered; howls and screams. It was a mad spectacle. I stood up where I was and watched my young fellows doing their part. The dance had hardly begun when my storm-troops, as they were named form that day forth, attacked. Like wolves, in parties of eight or ten, they rushed again and again on the enemy, and began gradually to sweep them literally out of the hall. After five minutes, I could see hardly one who was not streaming with blood. I was beginning to know their quality; at their head, my splendid Maurice Hess, my present private secretary, and many others, who, though badly hurt, continued to attack as long as their legs would carry them.

A large crowd still remained in one corner of the hall, still resisting stubbornly. Then suddenly, two pistol shots were fired from the entrance in the direction of the platform, and a wild din rose. One's heart almost rejoiced at such a revival of old war memories. It was impossible to distinguish by whom the shots were fired; but at any rate, I could see that my young men renewed the attack with increased spirit, until finally the last disrupters were driven from the hall.

It had taken about twenty-five minutes, by the end we were masters of the situation. Hermann Esser, who was chairman for the evening, announced: 'The meeting shall continue; allow the speaker to proceed.' So I went on with my speech.

Just as the meeting was over, an excited police lieutenant suddenly rushed into the hall and roared, waving his arms: 'The meeting is closed!' I had to laugh; it was real official pomposity.

We learned much that evening, and our adversaries also did not forget the lesson they received.

Up until the autumn of 1923, the *Münchener Post* omitted all mention of the fists of the proletariat.

VIII

THE STRONG MAN IS STRONGEST WHEN ALONE

THE average citizen is pleased and reassured when he hears that our labor groups, by joining together in a trades union, have discovered the element which unites them in one body and rejects that which divides them. Everyone is convinced that such union is an immense gain in strength, and that the once weak little groups are thereby converted suddenly into a power. And yet, this is for the most part quite incorrect!

Someone man proclaims one true thing, appeals for solution of some definite problem, marks out an objective, and creates a movement having as its aim the realization of his intentions. This is how a union or a party is founded, whose program is aimed either at removing existing evils or at attaining a definite condition of things at some future period.

Once such a movement has come to life, it can thereby claim, a right of priority. The natural course should be that all those who desire to struggle for the same objective as that movement should identify themselves with it and thus add to its strength, in order to better able serve the joint aspiration.

There are two reasons why this is not how things come to pass. The first reason may almost be described as tragic; the second is pitiable, and has its foundation in human weakness.

Every great action in this world is, in general, the fulfillment of a desire long present in millions of human hearts, of a universal longing. It is an essential characteristic of great questions of any period that thousands are at work on solving them, and many imagine themselves proposed for election by Destiny to that end, so that, in the free play of forces, the stronger and bolder shall be finally victorious and shall be entrusted with the task.

The tragic side of it is that these men struggle towards the same objective by different roads; each one, genuinely believing in his own mission, considers himself bound to go his own way, in total disregard of the others.

Not infrequently, the human race has owed its successes to the lessons learned from the misfortunes of former attempts that have come to grief.

In history we see that the two paths, which at one time might possibly have solved the German problem and whose chief representatives and champions were Austria and Prussia, Habsburg and Hohenzollern, ought to have lain together from the first; all the rest according to their opinions, ought to have entrusted their combined forces to the one party or the other. Then the path of the champion who ended by being the worthier would have been the one to follow; the Austrian method would never have led on to a German Empire.

Finally that Empire, strong in German unity, arose out of what millions of Germans felt in their hearts to be the most terrible token of all of the conflict between brothers; for the German Imperial Crown was won in reality on the

battlefield of Königgrätz, and not in the fights around Paris, as is commonly asserted. The foundation of the German Empire was not the outcome of any joint desire pursued by joint methods, but was the outcome rather of a deliberate struggle (at times hardly conscious) for hegemony, and out of that struggle, Prussia emerged victorious.

It is therefore not to be regretted if a number of men set out to attain the same objective; it is thus that we recognize the strongest and the swiftest, and the man who conquers.

The second reason is not merely tragic; it is pitiable. It arises from the sad mixture of envy, greed, ambition, and readiness to steal, which appear, alas! So often combined in matters which interest humanity.

The moment that a new movement has begun, and has adopted its own particular program, men come forward claiming to fight for the same objective. This does not mean that they intend to take their places honestly in the ranks of the movement and so admit its right of priority, but that they mean to steal its program, and form a new party based on it.

The founding of a whole number of new groups, parties, etc., calling themselves 'Nationalist' in the years 1918-19, came to pass with no merit to their founders, but as a natural development. By 1920, the National Socialist German Workers' Party had gradually become crystallized as the victorious party. Nothing proves the genuine honesty of certain individual founders more wonderfully than the fact that several of them decided with admirable promptitude to sacrifice their own obviously less successful movement; that is, to close it down and affiliate it unconditionally with the stronger one.

This was the case especially with the protagonist of the German Socialist Party in Nuremberg, Julius Streicher. The two parties were started with similar aims, but were otherwise quite independent of one another. As soon, however, as Streicher was convinced clearly and unquestionably of the superior strength and stronger growth of the National Socialist German Workers' Party, he ceased working for the German Socialist Party, and called upon his adherents to come into line with the National Socialist German Workers' Party, which had emerged victorious out of the contest, and had to combine with it in continuing to fight for the common cause. A decision highly commendable, but difficult for him as a man.

It ought never to be forgotten that no really great achievement has ever been effected in this world by coalitions; but it has always been due to the triumph of one individual man. Successes achieved by coalitions, owing to the nature of their source, contain the seeds of future disintegration from their very start, to the extent, indeed, of forfeiting what has already been attained. Great alterations of thought, which really revolutionize the world, are inconceivable and unrealizable, except in the form of titanic struggles conducted by single forces – never of enterprises conducted by coalitions.

The natural State, therefore, will never be created by the unstable volition of a nationalist union of organizations, but only by the adamantine will power of a single movement, *after* that movement has won through, having defeated all others.

IX

THOUGHTS ON THE MEANING AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STORM DETACHMENTS

THE strength of the old State rested on three pillars: the monarch, the administrative bodies, and the army. The Revolution of 1918 swept the monarchy away, disorganized the army, and delivered the administrative bodies over to party corruption. Thus, the props essential to the States authority were cut away from under it. The latter depends always upon three elements, which lie essentially at the foundation lf all authority.

The first constant factor essential to authority is *popular support*. But, authority, resting upon this foundation alone, is utterly weak, unstable, and wavering. The second element of all authority is evidently *power*. If popular support and power are joined together, and can survive for a certain period in unison, authority may then be found to rest on an even firmer foundation, the authority of *tradition*. If once popular support, power and the authority of tradition are united in one, authority may be considered to be unshakable.

The revolution cut out any possibility of this last chance. In fact, the authority of tradition no longer existed. The breakup of the old Empire, the destruction of the symbols of its former *grandeur*, rudely tore down tradition, the result being a heavy blow to the State's authority.

Even the second pillar of the State's authority, power, was no longer present. In order to succeed at all with the Revolution, the leaders were forced to upset the organized force and power of the State – the army; nay, they were even obliged to use the tattered fragments of the army as a fighting force for the Revolution.

Authority could not possible look for support in those mutinous mobs of soldiers who regarded military service in the light of an eight-hour day. Thus, the second element, the one security for authority, was taken away, and Revolution actually enjoyed none but the original one, popular support, wherewith to build up its authority.

Every nation may be divided into three classes: at one end the best men of the nation, good in the sense of every virtue, and especially distinguished by their courage and readiness for self-sacrifice; at the other end, the worst dregs of humanity, bad in the sense that they are self-seeking and depraved. In the middle between the two extremes lies the third class, the broad intermediate stratum, in whom there is neither the spirit of heroism, nor of mean criminality.

It is remarkable that the mass of the people – the intermediate class, as I wish to call them – never come into prominence, except when the two extreme classes meet in conflict, and that, if one of the extremes is victorious, they at all times readily submit themselves to the victor. If the best men achieve dominion, the masses will follow them; if the worst come to the top, the masses at least make no attempt to resist them; for the intermediate mass will never fight.

The spectacle at the end of the War was as follows: The great middle stratum of the nation had, as in duty bound, paid its toll of blood; the extreme section of the best men had sacrificed themselves, almost to a man with typical heroism; the extreme of the worst, protected by utterly foolish laws, and by neglect to apply the Articles of War, as they should have been applied, were kept alive almost to a man. This carefully preserved scum of our nation then made the Revolution, and it was only able to do so because the extreme section of the best was no longer there to withstand it. It had all been killed in a battle.

Those Marxist freebooters could not depend for long on popular support alone for their authority. And yet, the young Republic had need of it at any cost, for they were not willing, after a short period of chaos, to be crushed down suddenly by a punitive force, assembled out of the last relics of the good element of our nation.

The element that harbored the revolutionary idea, and carried it through the Revolution, was neither able nor ready to furnish the soldiers to protect it. For what that element wanted was not to organize a State, but to disorganize what existed; it suited their instincts better. Their password was not order and construction for the German Republic, but rather Plundering of it.

There appeared then for the first time numbers of young Germans, ready, in the service, as they said, of peace and order, to draw on the soldier's tunic again, shoulder their rifles and put their steel helmets to go against the destroyers of their homeland. They assembled into bodies as volunteers, and set to work, all the time hating the Revolution, to protect it and thus strengthen it in practice. They acted thus in all good faith.

The real organizer of the Revolution, and its actual wirepuller, the international Jew, had gauged the situation correctly. The time had not arrived for thrusting the German nation into the blood-slough of Bolshevism, as had happened in Russia. The question were: What would the troops from the front do about it? Would the men in the field-grey stand it?

During those weeks, the Revolution in Germany was forced to give at least an appearance of extreme moderation, if it was not to run the risk of being cut to pieces in a moment by two or three German divisions. For if even a single divisional commander had made up his mind then and there, with his faithful division, to drag down the red flag and stick the 'councils' up against a wall, or to break any resistance with *Minenwerfer* and hand-grenades, that division would not have taken a month to grow into an army of six divisions. The Jew wirepuller was terrified of this more than anything.

The Revolution, however, was not made by the forces of peace and order, but by those of riot, robbery, and plunder. And the further development of the Revolution was not in accord with the will of these latter elements, nor for tactical reasons could its course be explained or made palatable to them.

As Social Democracy gradually gained power, that movement dropped more and more the character of a Revolution of brute force.

Even before the War was over, and while the Social Democratic Party, deriving its character from the inertia of the masses, hung like a load of lead on the neck of the national defense, the radical-activist elements were extracted from it, and formed into new and aggressive columns of attack. These were the Independent Party, and the Spartacus Union- the storm-battalions of revolutionary Marxism. But when the army returning from the front appeared in the light of a menacing sphinx, the natural course of the Revolution had to be toned down. The main body of the Social Democratic host took charge of the conquered positions, and the Independents and Spartacists were thrust on one side. This did not happen without a struggle. The change had hardly taken place when there appeared two camps side by side: the party of peace and order, and the group of bloody terror. Was it not perfectly natural that the bourgeoisie should betake themselves with colors flying into the camp of peace and order?

The result was that the enemies of the Republic ceased fighting against it, as such, and helped to subjugate those who were themselves also enemies of the Republic, if for very different reasons. A further result is that all danger that the adherents of the old State may put up a fight against the new one is averted for good.

If we consider how the Revolution was able – quite apart from the faults in the old State, which were the cause of it – to be successful when it came to the point, we arrive at the following conclusions:

(1) It was due to the deadening of our conceptions of duty and obedience, and

(2) to the timorous passiveness of the parties who are supposed to maintain our State.

The first was at the bottom due to our wholly non-national and purely State education. From this, came the misconception of means and ends. Consciousness and fulfillment of duty and obedience are not ends in themselves, no more than that the State is an end in itself, but they should all be means for making possible and ensuring the existence of a community, living a life spiritually and physically similar.

The Revolution succeeded because our people, or rather our governments, had lost all true feeling for these conceptions, so that they had become weak, formal and doctrinaire.

As regards to the second point, the bourgeois parties, which may be termed the only political formations existing under the old State, were convinced that they ought to urge their view solely by intellectual methods, since physical methods belonged to the State alone. This was senseless at a period when the political adversary had long discarded that point of view, and was declaring with complete frankness that it meant, if it could, to attain its political ends by force.

The political program of the bourgeois parties rested on the past, in so far as they had not already become reconciled to the new state of affairs; their aim, however, was to have a share, if possible, in the new conditions. But their sole weapon was still as before, words, and words only.

The only elements, which at that time had strength and courage to oppose Marxism, and the masses, which it excited, were first of all the Free Corps, and

later on, the organizations for self-defense, and Einwohnerwehr, and finally the bonds of tradition.

The success of Marxism in days gone by was due to the interplay of political determination and ruthless force. What robbed Nationalist Germany of any practical hope of shaping German development was the lack of determined cooperation of ruthless force with political inspiration.

Whatever aspirations the Nationalist parties might possess, they were quite powerless to obtain them by fighting – certainly not in the streets.

The defense associations had all the force; they were masters of the streets, but they were without political ideas or aims, for which their power might have been used with profit to Nationalist Germany.

The Jew it was who was brilliantly successful in disseminating the conception of the 'apolitical character' of the defense associations by means of his press, just as in politics he always cunningly emphasized the 'purely intellectual' character of the struggle.

The lack of a new and great idea is at all times a sign of a lack of a fighting force. The conviction that there is a right to use weapons, even the most brutal, ever goes hand in hand with fanatical belief that a new and revolutionizing order of things must be victorious in the world.

A movement that fails to fight for such high ideals and aims will never fight to the very last.

In producing a great new idea, the French Revolution discovered the secret of success. It was the same with the Russian Revolution, and fascism drew its strength solely from the idea off submitting an entire nation to a process of complete regeneration – with happy results for that nation.

When the Reichswehr was formed and consolidated, Marxism gradually obtained the force necessary for the support of its authority, and began, as a logical consequence, to discard the seemingly dangerous Nationalist defense associations, on the ground that they were now superfluous.

The foundation of the National Socialist German Workers' Party was the first sign of any movement whose aim was not, like that of the bourgeois parties, a mechanical restoration of the past, but setting up of an organically nationalist State in place of the present senseless State mechanism. True to its conviction of the paramount importance of the new doctrine, the young movement naturally considers that no sacrifice is too great in order to obtain that objective.

It has happened time and again in the world's history that a period of terror, based upon a world theory, has never been broken by formal State authority, but always has given way to a new and different world-theory, equally bold and determined. This may hurt the feelings of champions of States in official positions, but that will not do away with the facts.

The State is being overrun by Marxism. Seeing that it gave in unconditionally to Marxism on November 9th, 1918, it will not rise up all of a sudden tomorrow to subdue it; on the contrary, the bourgeois noddles who occupy Minister's seats already babble of the necessity of not taking action against the workers, showing that by 'workers' they are thinking of Marxism.

I have already described how for the practical purpose of our young movement, a corps for the protection of meetings was slowly formed, and that this gradually assumed the character of a body of troops for keeping order and was looking forward to taking shape as an organizing body.

At that time, this body was at first merely a guard for meetings. Its earliest tasks were limited to making it possible to hold meetings which otherwise would have been stopped dead by our opponents. These men were trained merely for attack, not because, as was asserted in foolish German Nationalist circles, their ideal was the rubber blackjack, but because they realized there was no chance for ideals if the defender of them was clubbed with one; indeed, it has occurred not infrequently in history, that the greatest leaders have come to a bad end by the hand of some diminutive helot. They did not regard violence as an aim, but they desired to protect those who proclaimed the great ideal aim against being overpowered by violence. They realized also that it was not their duty to undertake protection of a State that was not protecting the nation against those who threatened to destroy nation and State.

The Storm Detachment, as they were called, is but one section of the movement, just as propaganda, the press, the scientific institute, etc., are simply sections of the party.

The idea underlying the formation of the Storm Detachment was the intention, side by side with high bodily training, to make it to an absolutely convinced defender of the National-Socialist idea, and to perfect its discipline. It was to have nothing in common with any defense organization in the bourgeois sense, nor yet with any secret organization.

My reason for guarding strictly at that time against allowing the Storm Detachment of the National Socialist German Workers' Party to be raised as a so-called defense association was as follows:

For every practical reason the defense of a nation cannot be carried out by private defense associations, unless backed up by all the forces of the State. It is utterly out of the question to form organizations with any military value for a definite purpose with so-called 'voluntary discipline.' The main support for getting orders carried out is lacking, namely, the power of inflicting punishment. In the spring of 1919, it was possible to raise 'volunteer corps' simply because most of the men had fought at the front, and had been through the school of the old army. That spirit is entirely wanting in the 'defense organizations' of today.

Assuming that, in spite of all difficulties, some associations were to be successful in converting a definite number of Germans into men, true in sentiment and proficient in bodily and military training, the result must of necessity be nil in a State whose tendency is not to desire to create such a force, which, in fact,

detests the idea, since it is utterly out of harmony with the intimate aims of the leaders – the corruptors of the State. This is the case today. It is not ridiculous for a government to be prepared to train some ten thousand men in a hole-and-corner fashion when a few years earlier the State, having shamefully sacrificed eight and a half millions of highly trained soldiers, not merely had no further use for them, but, as a mark of gratitude for their sacrifices, exposed them to universal execration? It is expected that soldiers will be trained for a régime which besmirched and spat upon its most glorious soldiers, tore off their medals and badges, trod their banners underfoot, and cast contempt upon their achievements? Or has this State régime ever taken a single step towards restoring the honor of the old army or towards forcing those who destroyed and abused it to answer for what they did? Not one step! On the contrary, these lasts can be seen occupying the highest posts under the State. And yet they said at Leipzig: 'Right goes with might,' Since, however, might is today in the hands of the very men who originally contrived the Revolution, and since that Revolution represents the cruelest betrayal of the country, the most scoundrelly act in the whole of German history, there can surely be no reason why might of that character should be increased by formation of a new young army. All sensible reasoning is against it.

If the State, as it is today, adopted the system of trained defense bands, it could never be applied to the defense of national interests outside of the country, but could only be used for protecting the nation's oppressors inside of the country against the rage of the betrayed and bartered nation, which might one day rise in its wrath.

For this reason, our Storm Detachments were not allowed to have anything to do with military organization. They were purely an instrument for protecting and educating the National-Socialist movement, and their tasks lay in quite another direction from that of any so-called defense association.

Neither did they represent a secret organization. The aims of secret organizations only be unlawful ones.

What we needed then and need now was and is not a hundred or two wrong-headed conspirators, but a hundred thousand, and again, a hundred thousand fanatical fighters for our world-theory. The work must be done, not in secret conventicles, but by powerful massed strokes; the road cannot be cleared for the movement by dagger, poison, or pistol, but by conquering the man in the street. We have to instruct Marxists that future control of the street will be in the hands of National Socialists, just as they will be in the future the masters of the State.

There is another danger from secret organizations, in that their members often fail completely to understand the greatness of the task, and are apt to imagine that the success of the national cause can be assured all at once by means of a single murder. Such an idea may find historical justification in cases where a nation has been suffering under the tyranny of some gifted oppressor. During 1919 and 1920, there was a danger that members of secret organizations, inspired by great examples in history and carried away by the magnitude of the nations' misfortune, might attempt to take vengeance on the corruptors of their

country, under the belief that thus they would put an end to the misery of their nation. All such attempts were pure folly, because the Marxist victory was not due to the superior genius of some outstanding individual leader, but to the measureless incompetence and cowardice of the bourgeois world.

If, then, the Storm Detachment may be neither a military organization, nor a secret society, it must be evolved under the following principles:

1. Its training must be carried out, not on military principles, but from the point of view of what is best for the party. Seeing that its members must be fit in body, focus must be set, not on drill, but on training for sports. I have always considered boxing and jujitsu more important than mediocre training in marksmanship.

2. In order to prevent the Storm Detachment from assuming any character of secrecy, not only must the uniform be universally recognized, but also the road that the organization must take, so as to be of most use to the movement, must be clearly defined and universally known. It must not work by secret means.

3. The formation and organization of the Storm Detachment must not be a copy of the old army as regards uniform and equipment, but must be chosen so as to be suitable to the tasks it has before it.

There were three events that turned out to be of great importance for the later development of the Storm Detachment:

1. The great general demonstration by all the patriotic societies in the late summer of 1922 on the Königsplatz in Munich against the law for the defense of the Republic. In the procession of societies, the National-Socialist movement also took a part, it was led by six Munich companies, followed by the sections of the political party. I, myself had the honor of addressing the multitude, which amounted to sixty-thousand people, as one of the speakers. The arrangements were a tremendous success, because, in spite of all threats from the Reds, it was proved for the first time that nationalist Munich was able to parade in the streets.

2. The expedition to Coburg in October 1922. certain 'nationalist' societies had decided to hold a 'German Day' at Coburg. I was invited to take part, with a recommendation to bring some of my friends with me. I picked eight hundred men of the Storm Detachment to go with me by special train to the little town, which had become part of Bavaria.

At the station at Coburg, we were met by a deputation of the organizers of the 'German Day' who announced that it had been 'arranged' at the orders of local trades unions – that is, the Independent and Communist Party – that we should not enter the town with our flags flying, and our band playing (we had a band of forty-two musicians), and should not march with closed ranks. I rejected these shameful conditions forthwith and did not fail to express to the gentlemen who arranged this 'Day' my astonishment at their negotiating with such people and coming to an agreement with them, and declared the Storm Detachment would instantly march in company formation into the town with flags flying and the band playing.

In the station yard, we were received by a yelling crowd, numbering many thousands. 'Murderers,' 'bandits,' 'robbers,' 'criminals,' were the pet names, which whose pattern founders of the German Republic showered upon us. The young Storm Detachment maintained perfect order. We marched to the court of the Hofbräuhauskeller in the center of the town. In order to prevent the crowd from following us, the police locked the gates of the court on us. As this was intolerable, I demanded that the police should open the gates. After long hesitation, they complied. We marched back by the road we had come over to our quarters, and there we had finally to face the crowd. The representatives of true Socialism, equality, and brotherhood, took to throwing stones. Our patience was at an end, and we hit out right and left for ten minutes, and a quarter of an hour later, there was no more red to be seen in the streets.

There were serious collisions during the night. Patrols of the Storm Detachment came upon National Socialists who had been attacked singly and were in a deplorable condition. Short work was made with the enemy.

By the next morning, the Red terror, under which Coburg had suffered for years, was broken.

The next day, we marched onto the square, where it was announced that a demonstration of ten thousand workers was to be held. Instead of ten thousand as announced, there were only a hundred present, who kept silent on the whole as we drew near. Here and there, bodies of Reds, who had come in from the outside and did not yet know us, tried to get up a quarrel; but they quickly lost any wish to do that. It was becoming obvious that the population, which had for so long been miserably intimidated, was now slowly waking up, and gaining courage to greet us with shouts, and when we departed in the evening, spontaneous cheering broke out.

Our experiences at Coburg proved at how essential it was to introduce a regular uniform for the Storm Detachment, not only for the purpose of strengthening *esprit de corps*, but also to avoid confusion, and failure to recognize the men opposing it. Up to that time, it had worn merely the armband, but now the tunic and the well-known cap were added.

We learned also of the importance of going by a regular plan to all places in which the Red terror had for many years prevented those who thought differently from holding any meeting, of breaking down the Red terror, and re-establishing freedom of assemblage.

3. In March 1923, an event occurred which forced me to divert the course of the movement and introduce changes.

In the early part of that year, the Ruhr was occupied by the French, and this was subsequently of great importance in the development of the Storm Detachment.

It is not today possible, nor is it to the national interest, to speak or write about it in public. The occupation of the Ruhr, which did not come upon us as a surprise, gave good reason for hoping that we should cease our cowardly policy of submission, and that the defense associations would now have something definite to do. It was likely that the Storm Detachment as well, which contained

several thousand strong young men, would not be deprived of a share in this national service. During the spring and summer of 1923, its transformation into a fighting military organization took place. To this was due in great part the later developments during that year, as far as they concerned our movement.

The events at the close of 1923, though they appeared disgusting at first sight, yet, when looked at from a higher plane, were almost a necessity, since they put an end at one blow to the conversion of the Storm Detachment, which was now doing harm to the movement. At the same time, however, these events opened a possibility of one day reconstructing at the point at which we had been forced to diverge from the straight course. [1]

In 1925, the National Socialist German Workers' Party was refounded, and it will have to reconstruct and organize its Storm Detachment on the principles mentioned in the beginning. It will have to return to its original sound principles, and will have to regard it, as its highest duty to make the Storm Detachment into an instrument for defense and strength in the fight for the world-theory of the movement.

It must not allow the Storm Detachment to sink to the level of a secret organization; it must rather take steps to make of it a guard of one hundred thousand men for the National-Socialist, and thus deeply nationalist idea.

---

[1] The allusion is to the failure of the 'Hitler Putsch' in November of 1923

X

THE SHAM OF FEDERALISM

IN THE winter of 1919, and still more in the spring and summer of 1920, the young party was obliged to adopt an attitude towards a question that had become important even during the War. In Part I of this volume, I described shortly the signs, visible to myself, of the menace of Germany's collapse, with special reference to the system of propaganda directed by the English, and also the French, towards widening the old rift between the North and South of Germany. It was in the spring of 1915 that the system of articles and leaflets against Prussia, as being the sole cause of the War, first appeared. Up until 1916, it was developed and perfected in a cunning and shameful manner. It counted upon the lowest instincts of mankind, and began exciting the South German against the North German, and the fruits of the agitation soon made their appearance. The leaders, both in the government and in the army (especially the Bavarian army), may well be reproached; they cannot escape blame for failing, with criminal blindness and laxity, to take action against it with proper determination. Nothing was done! On the contrary, some of them seemed to see it with no great displeasure, and were perhaps unintelligent enough to imagine that such propaganda might not only add a bolt in the unification of the German nation, but might even automatically strengthen the forces of rebellion. Hardly ever in history has such wicked neglect received heavier punishment. The enfeeblement which Prussia suffered by it attacked the whole of Germany. It hastened the collapse, which ruined not Germany alone, but much more certainly the individual States themselves.

In the town in which the artificially excited hatred against Prussia raised most violently, the revolt against the reigning House was the start of the Revolution. It would be wrong to imagine that the enemy propaganda was alone responsible for the anti-Prussian feeling. The unbelievable methods of our war organizers who gathered – and swindled – the entire Empire into an absolutely mad system of centralization in Berlin was a main cause of that anti-Prussian feeling.

The Jew was far too cunning not to realize than that the infamous campaign of plunder which he organized against the German nation under the cloak of the War societies was bound to arouse opposition. As long as it did not spring at his own throat, he had no cause to be afraid. Thus, it occurred to him that there could be no better recipe for averting a rising of the masses driven to desperation and exasperation, than to let their rage flame up and spend itself in some other direction.

Then came the Revolution.

The International Jew, Kurt Eisner, started to play off Bavaria against Prussia. In deliberately aiming the revolutionary movement in Bavaria against the rest of the Reich, he was not acting in the least from the point of view of Bavaria, but as one commissioned by Jewry to do so. He exploited the existing instincts and

dislikes of the Bavarian people, in order by their means to dismember German the more easily. The Reich, once laid in ruins, would have easily fallen to Bolshevism.

The art of the bolshevist agitators, in representing the advance of the contingents of liberation to put an end to the Republics of the Committees as a victory of Prussian militarism over the anti-militarist and anti-Prussian elements bore rich fruits. Whereas at the time of the elections for the Bavarian Legislative Assembly, Kurt Eisner had not ten thousand followers in Munich and the Communist Party had fewer than three thousand, after the collapse of the Republic of Committees, the two parties fused together and numbered nearly one hundred thousand.

I think that never in my life did I start a more unpopular work than I did in my stand against the anti-Prussian incitement. In Munich during the Committees period, the first mass meeting took place, at which hatred against the rest of Germany, especially Prussia, was lashed to such a heat of frenzy that if a North German attended a meeting, it was at the risk of his life. Those demonstrations usually ended with wild shouts of 'Away with Prussia!' 'Down with Prussia!' 'War against Prussia!' – a sentiment summed up in the German Reichstag by a brilliant defender of Bavaria's sovereign interests, in the battle-cry, 'Rather die as a Bavarian, than rot as a Prussian!'

The fight that I had undertaken, at first by myself, and afterwards with the support of my War comrades, was now carried on almost, I might say, as a sacred duty by the young movement. I am proud to be able to say today that we – depending almost exclusively on our adherents in Bavaria – were responsible for putting an end, slowly but surely, to that combination of folly and treason.

It is, of course, obvious that the agitation against Prussia had nothing to do with Federalism. Federative activities are most inappropriate when their object is to break up or dismember another Confederation. For a genuine Federalist, for whom Bismarck's conception of the Empire is not an empty phrase, could not in the same breath desire to cut off portions of the Prussian State, which was created and perfected by Bismarck, nor could he publicly support such separatist aspiration. It is the more unbelievable, since the battle waged by these so-called Federalists was against the element in Prussia, which could least be considered as being connected with the November Democracy. For their slanders and attacks were not directed against the fathers of the Weimar Constitution, who consisted mostly of South Germans and Jews, but against the representatives of the old Conservative Prussia, the very antipodes of the Weimar Constitution. We need feel no astonishment that they were especially careful not to encroach upon the Jews; but this perhaps gives the key for solving the entire riddle. The Jews objective was to cite the 'National' elements in Germany against each other – to set Conservative Bavaria against Conservative Prussia. And he was successful.

In the winter of 1918, anti-Semitism began to take root throughout Germany. The Jew returned to his old methods. With amazing promptitude, he hurled the brand

of contention into the popular movement, and started a fresh rift. In casting up the Ultramontane question, and in the contentions rising out of it lay, as things then were, the sole possibility of occupying popular attention with other problems, so as to stem the attack concentrated on Jewry. The men who infected our nation with this question can never repair the evil they committed against it. The Jew has certainly succeeded in his aim; he is delighted in seeing Catholics and Protestants fighting against each other; the enemy of all Aryan humanity and Christendom laughs in his sleeve.

The two Christian Churches are looking upon this pollution and destruction of a noble and unique existence, granted by God's grace to this earth, with indifferent eyes. For the world's future, however, the importance of it all is not whether the Protestants beat the Catholics, but rather whether the Aryan man holds his own or dies out. And yet today, the two confessions are fighting, not against the destroyer of the Aryan, but they are mutually trying to annihilate each other.

In Germany, it is not permissible to promote a struggle against Ultramontanism or clericalism, as it might be in purely Catholic countries, for the Protestants would certainly take a hand in it. The defense, which Catholics in other countries would put up against attacks political in character, on their religious leaders would in Germany at once assume the form of an attack by Protestantism against Catholicism.

For the rest, the facts speak for themselves. The men, who in 1924 suddenly discovered that the main mission of the Nationalist movement was a struggle against 'Ultramontanism' failed to break Ultramontanism down, but they did succeed in splitting the Nationalist movement. I must add my warning, in case some immature brain in the Nationalist movement should imagine that it can do what a Bismarck was unable to do. It will be the main duty of those who lead the National-Socialist movement to oppose absolutely any attempt to offer the services of their movement for any such struggle and to expel from its ranks on the spot those who conduct propaganda for that objective. As a matter of fact, we had continuous success in this throughout the autumn of 1923. Fervent Protestants could stand side by side with fervent Catholics in our ranks without the slightest qualms of conscience as regards their religious convictions.

The States of the American Republic did not make the Union, but it was the Union that created most of the so-called States. The very comprehensive rights granted to the various territories express not only the essential character of that Union of States, but are in harmony with the vastness of the area which they cover, almost attaining to the dimensions of a continent. Thus, in speaking of the States of the American Union, one cannot refer to them as having State sovereignty, but as enjoying rights, or better, perhaps, privileges, determined and guaranteed by the Constitution.

In Germany, however, the individual States were originally sovereign States, and the Empire was formed out of them. But the formation of the Empire did not take place by reason of the free will and equal cooperation of the individual States, but because one State, Prussia, achieved hegemony over the others.

The great difference in size of territory between the German States by itself prevents any comparison with the American Union. Moreover, the difference in size between the smallest of them or the larger, or rather the largest of them, demonstrates the inequality of achievement and of the share in founding the Empire and in forming the confederation of States. It cannot be maintained that most of the Stares ever really enjoyed genuine 'sovereignty.'

The rights of sovereignty, which the States renounced in order to make the Empire possible, were given up in a very small measure of their own free will. In most cases, they were either nonexistent, or they had simply been lost under the pressure of Prussia's superior strength. The principle followed by Bismarck was not to give the State merely what had been taken away from the smaller States, but to demand from the States what the Empire absolutely required. But it is quite wrong to ascribe this decision of Bismarck's to any conviction on his part that the State was thus acquiring all the rights of sovereignty which it would require for all time; on the contrary, he meant to leave over for the future what would have been hard to attain at the moment. And the sovereignty of the State has, inn actual fact, continuously increased at the expense of the individual States. The passing of time achieved what Bismarck hoped it would achieve.

The German collapse and the destruction of the monarchial State for necessarily hastened these developments.

The same cause struck a hard blow at the federative character of the Reich; a harder blow still was struck by the acceptation of the obligations under the Peace Treaty.

It was both natural and obvious that the countries lost control of their finances and had to renounce them to the Reich, from the moment when the Reich, having lost the War, submitted to financial obligations, which were never considered as being covered by contributions from the individual States. The further decision, which led to the Reich taking over the railways and postal services, was a necessary and progressive step in the gradual enslavement of our nation under the Peace Treaty.

Bismarck's Empire was free and unbound. It was not weighed down by the wholly unproductive financial obligations, such as the present Dawes Germany has to carry on her back. Its expenditure was confined to a few absolutely necessary items of domestic importance. It was therefore well able to do without financial supremacy, and to live on the money contributed by the confederated States; and naturally the fact that the States retained their rights of sovereignty and had comparatively little to pay to the Empire contributed to their satisfaction in being members of the Empire. But, it is both incorrect and dishonest to wish to make propaganda with the assertion that whatever dissatisfaction there existed was attributable solely to the financial bondage suffered by the States at the hands of the Empire. No, this was truly not the case. The wane of joy in thought of the Empire should not be attributed to loss of sovereign rights, but it is rather the result of the miserable way in which the German nation was then represented by its State.

Thus, the State today is forced for reasons of self-preservation to curtail more and more the sovereign rights of individual countries, not only from the general material standpoint, but on principle also. For, seeing that it is draining the last drops of the blood of its citizens by its policy of financial squeezing, it is forced to withdraw the last of their rights, unless it is prepared to see the general discontent flame up into rebellion.

We National Socialists have therefore to admit the following basic principle:

A powerful national Reich, guarding and protecting the interests of its citizens abroad in the widest sense, is able to offer liberty at home; then it need have no anxiety for the solidity of the State. On the other hand, a powerful national government may take responsibility for large incursions on the liberty of individuals as well as of the State without risk of weakening the Empire idea, if only each citizen recognizes that such measures are measures aimed at making this nation great.

It is a fact that all the States in the world are moving in the direction f unification of their domestic policy, and Germany will not be out of the running in this respect.

However natural a certain measure of unification, especially in the area of communications, may appear to be, it is none the less the duty of the National Socialists to bring strong opposition against such a development in the State today, given that the sole object of these measures is to cover and make possible a disastrous foreign policy. For the very reason that the Reich of today proposes to bring under itself, the railways, the postal services, finances etc., for reasons which are not of high national policy, but in order to have in its hands the means and pledges for limitless fulfillment of obligations, we national Socialists must take every step that appears calculated to block, and, if possible, prevent such a policy.

Another reason for opposing centralization of this kind is that the Jewish-Democratic Reich, which has become a real curse to the German nation, is seeking to render impotent the objections raised by the States, which are not so far imbued with the spirit of the age, by crushing them to the point of making them totally unimportant.

Our standpoint has always to be that of high national policy, and must never be narrow or particularistic. This last observation is necessary, lest our adherents should come to imagine that we National Socialists would think of denying that the Reich has a right to assume a higher sovereignty than that of the individual States. There neither should, nor could be any question as to that right. Since for us the State in itself is but a form, whereas the essential is that which it includes – namely, the nation, the people – it is clear that everything else must be subordinated to the nation's interests; and in particular, we cannot permit any single State within the nation and the Reich (which represents the nation) to enjoy independent political sovereignty as a State. The enormity of allowing States of the Confederation to maintain legislations must and will be put to a

stop. As long as that continues to be possible, we have no right to wonder that foreigners continue to doubt the stability of the framework of our Stare and take their measures accordingly.

The importance of individual States will in the future be more on the cultural side. The monarch who did the most for the reputation of Bavaria was no obstinate particularist with anti-German sentiments, but one who was as much in sympathy with a greater Germany as he was with art – Ludwig I.

The army must be kept strictly apart from all individual State influences. The coming National-Socialist State must not slip into the mistake of the past in forcing the army to undertake a task that is not and never ought to be proper to it. The German army is not there for the purpose of providing a school for maintaining racial peculiarities, but rather for teaching all Germans to understand and get on with each other. All that tends to divisions in the nation's life must be converted by the army into a uniting influence. It must lift each youth above the narrow horizon of his own little country, and set him in his place within the German nation. He must learn to look on the frontiers, not of his home, but of his Fatherland; for it is those that he will have to protect one day. It is folly, therefore, to allow the young German to stay in his home, but a good thing to show Germany to him during the time of his military service. This is all the more essential today, since young Germans do not travel and so widen their horizon as once they used to.

The doctrines of National Socialism are not meant to serve the political interests of single States of the Confederation, but to lead the German nation. They must determine the life of an entire nation, and shape it afresh; they must therefore peremptorily claim the right to overstep boundaries, drawn according to political developments that we have rejected.

XI

PROPAGANDA AND ORGANIZATION

PROPAGANDA must rush on far in advance of organization and win over the human material on which organization is to work. I have always been an enemy of hasty and pedantic organization; for it is apt to lead to dead mechanical results. For this reason, it is best to allow an idea to be broadcast from a center by means of propaganda for a period, and then to search carefully through and examine for leaders among the human material which has been assembled. It will often happen that men, who do not show obvious capabilities at the start, turn out to be born leaders.

It is completely wrong to imagine that abundance of theoretical knowledge is necessarily a characteristic proof of the qualities and energies necessary for leadership. The contrary is frequently the case.

A great theorist is seldom a great leader. An agitator is far more likely to posses those qualities – which will be unwelcome news to those who work on a question is merely scientific. An agitator who is capable of communicating an idea to the masses has to be a psychologist, even though he is but a demagogue. He will always be better as a leader than the retiring theorist who knows nothing about men. For leadership means ability to move masses of men. The talent for producing ideas has nothing in common with capacity for leadership. But the union of theorist, organizer, and leader in one man is the rarest phenomena on this earth; therein consists greatness.

I have already described the attention I gave to propaganda in the earlier days of the movement. Its function was to inoculate a small nucleus of men with the new doctrine, so as to shape the material out of which the first elements of an organization might be formed later on. In the process, the aims of propaganda far exceed those of organization.

The work which propaganda has to do is to continue to win adherents to the idea, while the whole-hearted preoccupation of organization must be to make the best of the adherents into active members of the party. There is no need for propaganda to worry itself over the value of every single one of its scholars, as regards efficiency, capacity, intellect, or character, whereas it is the task of organization to carefully select out of the mass, any that may really conduce to the triumph of the movement.

The first task of propaganda is to win men for the coming organization; that of organization is to get men for carrying on propaganda. The second task of propaganda is to upset existing conditions, by means of the new doctrine, that of organization is to fight for power, in order through it to secure final success for the doctrine.

One of the mina tasks of organization is to see that no sign of disunion creeps into the membership of the movement, do cause divisions, and so lead to weakening of the work of the movement; also that the fighting spirit does not die

down, but is continually renewed and fortified. To this end, the membership should not be multiplied indefinitely; for, since energy and boldness only exist in a portion of mankind, a movement whose organization sets no limits to it, would of necessity one day become weak.

It is therefore essential, if only for purposes of self-preservation, that, as long as it is maintaining its success, a movement shall stop adding to its membership, and shall thenceforward exercise the greatest caution, and only after thorough examination consider increasing its organization. Only by this means will it keep the kernel of the movement fresh and healthy. It must see to it that this kernel continues to have sole control of the movement – that is, decides on the propaganda that is to lead to universal recognition, and, being in possession of all power, carries on the operations necessary for the practical realization of its ideals.

As controller of propaganda for the party, I was careful not merely to prepare the ground for the future greatness of the movement, but I worked on very radical principles, so that the best material was introduced into the organization. For the more radical and exciting my propaganda was, the more it frightened away weak and wavering characters, and prevented their penetrating into the inner kernel of our organization. And this was all to the good.

Up to the middle of 1921, this creative activity sufficed, and did nothing but good for the movement. But in the summer of that year, certain events made it obvious that the organization was failing to keep pace with the propaganda, the success of which was gradually appearing more evident.

In the years 1919-20, the movement had a committee in control of it, elected by the members in assembly. This committee, comically enough, embodied the very principle against which the movement was most keenly fighting, mainly, parliamentarianism.

I refuse to countenance such folly, and after a very short time, I ceased to attend the meetings of the committee. I made my propaganda for myself, and that was an end of it; I refused to allow any ignoramus to talk me into any other course. Similarly, I refrained from interfering with the others in their departments.

As soon as the new rules were adopted, and I was established as chairman of the party, thus acquiring the necessary authority, and the rights accompanying it, all such folly came to an immediate end. Decisions by committee were replaced by the principle of absolute responsibility. The chairman is responsible for entire control of the movement.

This principle gradually became recognized inside the movement as the natural one, at least as far as control of the party was concerned.

The best way to dissolve committees that did nothing, or merely brewed up unpractical recommendations was to set them to do some real work. It made one laugh to see how the members would silently fade away, and suddenly were nowhere to be found! It reminded me of our great institution of the same kind, the Reichstag. How quickly they would all blow away if they were to put some real

work, instead of just talk, especially if each member was made personally responsible for any work that he did!

In December of 1920, we acquired the Völkischer Beobachter. This paper, which, as its name suggests, was generally meant for popular consumption, was to become the organ for the National Socialist German Workers' Party. At first, it appeared twice weekly, but at the beginning of 1923, it became a daily paper, and at the end of August, it started appearing in its later well-known large form.

The Völkischer Beobachter was a so-called 'popular' organ with all the advantages, and, still more, the faults and weaknesses, attaching to popular institutions. Excellent though its contents were, its management was impossible as a business proposition. The underlying idea was that it ought to be maintained by popular subscription; it was not realized that it would have to make its way in competition with the rest, and that it would be indecent to expect the subscriptions of good patriots to cover mistakes and negligence on the business side of an enterprise.

I took great pains at the time to alter these conditions, the danger of which I soon recognized. In 1914, in the War, I made the acquaintance of Max Amann, who is now the general business director of the party. In the summer of 1921, I applied to my old comrade in the regiment, whom I met by chance one day, and asked him to become business manager for the movement. After long hesitation – for he already had a good position with prospects, he consented, but only on condition that he should not be at the mercy of incompetent committees; he must have to answer to one single master, and one only. What actually happened was that some men were taken on the staff of the paper who had formerly been attached to the Bavarian People's Party, but their work showed that they had excellent qualifications. The result of this experiment was eminently successful. It was owing to this honest and frank recognition of a man's real qualifications that the movement captured the hearts of its employees more swiftly and surely than had been the case ever before. Later on, they became and remained good National Socialists, not in word alone, and they proved it by the solid, steady, and conscientious work that they performed in the service of the new movement.

In the course of two years, I brought my views more and more into operation, and today, as far as the leadership in chief is concerned, they hold their ground as the most natural solution.

The obvious success of this system was shown on November 9, 1923. Four years previously, when I entered the movement, there was not even a rubber stamp. On November 9, 1923, the party was broken up, and its property confiscated. The total sum fetched by all objects of any value and by the paper amounted to over 170,000 gold marks.

XII

THE TRADES-UNION QUESTION

THE rapid growth of the movement obliged us in 1922 to adopt an attitude towards a question that is even now not altogether clear. In our efforts to study the quickest and easiest methods by which the movement might penetrate into the hear of the masses, we were continually met by the objection that the worker could never completely attach himself to us as long as his professional and economic interests were looked after by men holding other opinions than ours and his political organization was in their hands.

In Part I of this volume, I wrote on the nature and aims, and also the necessity of trades unions. I gave it as my opinion that, unless by means of State measures (which usually lead to nothing) or by a new ideal of education, the attitude of the employer towards the worker underwent a change, the latter would have no course but to undertake the defense of his own interests himself, by appealing to his equal rights as a contracting party in economic life. I went on to say that such defensive action impinged upon the entire national community, if, by reason of it, social injustices, involving serious injury to the life of the community, could not be prevented. I said, moreover, that the necessity of trades unions must be taken for granted, so long as the employers included among their numbers men who had of themselves no feeling for social obligation, or even for the most elementary rights of humanity.

In the present state of affairs, I am convinced that the trades unions cannot possibly be dispensed with. In fact, they are among the most important institutions in the economic life of the nation.

The national-Socialist movement, which aims at the National-Socialist State for the People, may entertain no doubts that every future institution of that State must be rooted in the movement itself. It is the greatest of errors to imagine that possession of power by itself will allow any definite reorganization to be accomplished, starting from nothing, without the help from a staff of men who have been trained beforehand in the spirit of the enterprise. Here also, the principle holds well that the spirit is always more important than the form, which can be created very speedily.

Thus, no one could propose suddenly dragging out of his portfolio the draft of a new constitution and expect to be able to 'introduce' it by an edict from above. It might be attempted, but the result would not survive; almost certainly, it would be a stillborn infant. I am reminded of the origin of the Weimar Constitution, and the attempt to palm off a new constitution and a new flag on the German nation, neither of them having any connection with anything known to our nation during the last half-century.

The National-Socialist State must avoid all such experiments; it must grow out of an organization that has already long been working. Hence, the National-Socialist movement must recognize the necessity of possessing a trades-union organization of its own.

What must be the nature of a National-Socialist trades union? What is our task, and what are its aims?

It is not an instrument of class war, but one for the defense and representation of the workers. The National Socialist State knows no classes, but, in a political sense, only citizens with absolutely equal rights, and similarly equal obligations, and, side by side with them, subjects absolutely without rights in the political sense.

The primary object of the trades-union system is not to fight in any war between classes, but Marxism forged it into an instrument for its own class war. Marxism created the economic weapon that the international Jew employs for destroying the economic basis of free and independent national States, for ruining their national industry and trade; its object being to make free nations the slaves of the world-finance of Jewry, which knows no State boundaries.

In the hands of the National-Socialist trades union, the strike is not an instrument for ruining the nation's production, but for increasing it and causing it to flow, by fighting against all the faults, which by their unsocial character, hinder efficiency in business and in the life of the entire nation.

The National-Socialist worker must be aware that the nation's prosperity means material happiness to himself.

The national-Socialist employer must be aware that happiness and contentment for his workers is an essential for the existence and development of his own great business enterprise.

It is senseless to have a National-Socialist trades union side by side with other trades unions. For it must be deeply convinced of the universality of its task, and the resulting obligation, be unhampered by other institutions with similar and perhaps hostile aims, and be ready to proclaim its own essential individuality. There can be no compromising with cognate aspirations; its absolute right to stand alone must be maintained.

There were, and still are, many arguments against founding trades unions of our own. I have always refused to consider experiments, which were bound to fail from the start. I should have considered it a crime to take form the worker a proportion of his hard-earned wages to pay for an institution, which I was not thoroughly convinced, would be of use to its members.

Our action in 1922 was based upon these opinions. Others apparently knew better and started trades unions. But it was not long before they disappeared. So that in the end, they were in the same position as ourselves. The difference was that we had betrayed neither ourselves, nor others.

XIII

GERMAN POLICY OF ALLIANCES AFTER THE WAR

THE fickleness of the Reich in the domain of foreign policy and its failure to follow the right principles in its policy of alliances was not only continued after the Revolution, but also continued in a worse form. For if before the War confusion of ideas in politics may be taken as the first cause of the bad State leadership in foreign affairs, after the War, on the other hand, it was honest intention that was lacking. It was obvious that the party, which had achieved its destructive aims by means of the Revolution, would not be interested in a policy of alliances, the object of which was reconstruction of the free German State.

As long as the National Socialist German Workers' Party was but a small and little known society, problems of foreign policy would seem of inferior importance in the eyes of many of our adherents. And indeed, the one essential preliminary to a struggle for exterior freedom is removal of the causes of our collapse, and the destruction of those who are profiting by it.

But from the moment that the small and insignificant society widened its sphere of operations, and attained the importance of a great association, it quickly became necessary to take note of the developments in foreign politics. We had to decide upon principles that should not only be in contradiction of our fundamental views, but should actually be an expression of them.

The essential and basic idea that is ever before us in considering this question is that foreign policy is but a means to an end. But the end is exclusively encouragement of our own nationality. No suggestion in foreign politics may be prompted by any consideration other than the following: Will it help or injure our nation now or in the future?

We have to consider, moreover, that the question of recovering territories, which a nation and State have lost, is always, first and foremost, one of recovering political power and independence for the mother country; also that in such a case the interests of lost territories must be ruthlessly ignored as against that of regaining the mother country's freedom. For the liberation of oppressed and cut-off splinters of a race or of the provinces of an Empire is not affected by reason of any desire of the oppressed population, or of a protest by those who remain, but by whatever means of power is still possessed by the remainder of the Fatherland, which was once common to all.

It is not by flaming protests that oppressed lands are brought back into the embrace of a common Reich, but by a sword ever ready to strike. It is the task of the leaders of a nation, in their domestic policy, to forge that sword; in their foreign policy, they must aim at the work of forging, and they must seek comrades.

In Part I of this volume, I described the half-heartedness of our policy of alliances before the War. Instead of a sound territorial policy inside Europe, our political leaders preferred one of colonies and trade. This was the more ill conceived, since they thus hoped to escape having to make the decision by arms. The result of this attempt was that, while hoping to sit upon all of the stools, they fell down, as usually happens, between them all, and the World War was the final retribution imposed on the Empire for its bad leadership. The right way would have been to strengthen the Empire's power on the Continent by winning fresh territory in Europe.

But since the fathers of the folly of our democratic Parliament refused to consider any regular scheme of preparation for war, any plan for acquiring lands in Europe was thrown over, and, by their preference for a policy of colonies and trade, they sacrificed the (then possible) alliance with England; at the same time they neglected to seek support from Russia – the logical course. Finally, they stumbled into the World War, deserted by all but the ill-omened Habsburg Dynasty.

The historic tendency of British diplomacy, the sole counterpart of which in Germany was the tradition of the Prussian army, was, ever since the example set by Queen Elizabeth, directed deliberately towards preventing every possible means the rise of any European Power beyond the general standard of greatness and breaking it by a military attack, if necessary. The means employed by England to that end varied according to the situation, and the task imposed; but the will and determination were always the same. The political independence of the former North American colonies led, as time went on, to mighty efforts to obtain a certainty of support on the continent of Europe.

Thus, after Spain and the Netherlands had sunk from being Great Powers, the forces of the British State were concentrated against the rising power of France, until finally, with the fall of Napoleon, the fear of the hegemony of the military power, which was the most dangerous of all to England, appeared to be broken for good and all.

The change of direction for British statesmanship against Germany was a slow process, because Germany, owing to her lack of national unity, presented no visible menace to England. By 1870-71, however, England had already adopted her new attitude. Her hesitations, occasioned by America's importance in world economics as well as by the development of Russia as a Power, were unfortunately not turned to advantage by Germany, with the result that the historic tendency of British statesmanship became more and more firmly established.

England regarded Germany as the Power whose ascendancy in trade – and therefore in world politics – as a consequence of her enormous industrialization was becoming a very serous menace. The conquest of the world by 'peaceful penetration,' which our statesmen thought to be the last word in wisdom, was selected by British politicians as their basis for organizing resistance. The fact that this resistance assumed the form of a fully organized attack was entirely

consistent in character with statesmanship whose aim was not maintenance of a questionable world peace, but the establishment of British world domination. The fact that England employed, as her allies, all States, which could be of use in a military sense, was equally consistent with her traditional foresight in estimating her opponents' strength, as well as with her knowledge of her own weak points at any given moment. This cannot be termed 'unscrupulousness' since to organize a war so completely is not to be judged by heroic standards, but by their suitableness to the occasion. It is the task of diplomacy to see to it that a nation does not go under heroically, but is maintained by practical means. Then every road which leads to that is the right one, and not to follow it is obviously a crime and flagrant neglect of duty.

When Germany turned revolutionary, all fear of the threat of world domination by Germany was over as far as it concerned British statesmanship. It was not to England's interest that Germany should be *entirely* obliterated from the map of Europe. On the contrary, the fearful collapse of November 1918, put British diplomacy face to face with a new situation, which was at once discovered to be possible: German destroyed, and France the strongest political Power on the Continent of Europe. The wiping out of Germany as a Power on the Continent would merely bring profit to England's enemies. And yet, between November 1918, and the summer of 1919, British diplomacy was not in a position to alter its attitude, since it had exploited the forces of sentiment in the public during the ling War more fully than ever before.

Moreover, to prevent the power of France from becoming too great, the only policy possible to England was participation in France's lust for robbery. In fact, England had failed to achieve what she was aiming at when she went to war. The rise of a European Power above and beyond the ratio of strength in the continental State system of Europe had not been prevented; it had in fact, been solidly established.

France's position today is unique. She is the first Power in a military sense, with no serious rival on the Continent; her frontiers are practically safe against Italy and Spain; she is protected against Germany by the Fatherland's powerlessness; her long stretch of coast is placed before the nerves of the life of the British Empire.

England's permanent desire is to maintain a certain balance of power between the States of Europe among themselves, since that appears to be a necessary condition for British hegemony in the world.

France's permanent desire is to prevent Germany from becoming a solid Power, to maintain a system of small States in Germany more or less equal to each other in power and without unified leadership. She wishes to hold the left bank of the Rhine as a guarantee for building up and securing her hegemony in Europe. The final aim of French diplomacy will be in eternal contradiction to the final tendencies of British statesmanship.

There dies not exist any British, American, or Italian statesman who could ever be designated as 'pro-German.' Every Englishman in his capacity as a statesman

is British first of all, and the same with every American. And no Italian would be prepared to further any policy other than pro-Italian. Anyone, therefore, who expects to build up alliances with foreign nations, relying on pro-Germanism among statesmen of other countries, is either an ass or no true man. For practical purposes at present, we must seek an answer to the following questions: What States just now are not vitally concerned that by the fact that, owing to complete extinction of a German Central Europe, France's military and economic power is attaining to a position of absolute and predominant hegemony? What Stares will, in view of their own conditions of existence and their hitherto traditional policy, regard such a development in the light of a menace to their future?

We must be absolutely clear on the fact that France is the permanent and inexorable enemy of the German nation; the key to her foreign policy will always be her desire to possess the Rhine frontier, and to secure that river for herself by keeping German broken up and in ruins.

England does not want Germany as a world Power; France does not want Germany to be a Power at all – a very essential difference! We, however, are not fighting today for a place as a world Power, but we have to struggle for our Fatherland's existence, for our national unity, and the daily bread of our children. From this point of view, only two States are left over for us: England and Italy.

England does not desire a France whose military power, unrestrained by the rest of Europe, might cover a policy likely one day to run counter to British interests; France's military predominance presses sorely on the heart of the world Empire of Great Britain.

Nor can Italy desire any further strengthening of France's position of power in Europe. Italy's future will always depend upon developments affecting the Mediterranean basin territorially. Her motive for entering the War was not any desire to aggrandize France, but rather her determination to give the deathblow to her hated rival on the Adriatic. Any increase of French strength on the Continent means restrictions for Italy's future, and she does not deceive herself into thinking that national relationships in any way exclude rivalries.

Cool and cautious consideration shows that it is these two States, England and Italy, whose own most natural interests are least in opposition to the conditions essential to the existence of the German nation, and are, in fact, to a certain extent identical with them.

Can any country ally itself with Germany as she is today? No. No Power that regards its dignity and hopes to get out of alliances something more than graft for greedy politicians will ally itself with Germany in her present condition; indeed, it could not do so. Our present unfitness for alliances is the main reason why the gang of robber-enemies holds together at all.

Little though it is to the interest of the British State policy that Germany should be further abased, such a development is very greatly to the interest of the Jews of international finance. In contradistinction to the interests of the welfare of the British State, the Jewry of finance desires not only Germany's perpetual

economic abasement, but also her complete political enslavement. Therefore, the Jew is the great agitator for Germany's destruction.

The trend of thought is Jewry is clear. It is to bolshevize Germany – that is, to rot away German national intelligence – and so crush the forces of German labor under the yolk of Jewish world-finance, as a preliminary to extending far and wide the Jewish plan of conquering the world.

In England, as in Italy, the divergence of views between sold statesmanship and the demands of the Jewish financial world is obvious; often, indeed, it is crudely apparent.

It is only in France that there is intimate agreement between the intentions of the stock exchange, as represented by the Jews and the desires of that nation's statesmen, who are chauvinistic by nature. This identity constitutes an immense danger to Germany, and it is the reason why France is by far the most terrible enemy of Germany.

It is, of course, not easy for us of the National Socialist movement to imagine England as a possible future ally. Our Jewish press succeeded again and again in concentrating hatred on England, and many a silly German bullfinch flew only too readily onto the bird-lime made ready by the Jews, chattered about 're-strengthening' the navy, protested against the loss of our colonies, and suggested that we ought to recover them; thus, they furnished the material for the Jewish rascal to turn over to his relations in England for use as propaganda. It ought by now to dawn on our foolish bourgeois politicians that what we have to fight for now is not 'sea-power.' Even before the War, it was folly to use up our national strength for such objects without first ensuring our position in Europe. An aspiration of that sort is one of those stupidities, which in politics go by the name of crimes.

I must mention one particular hobby, which the Jew bestrode with particular skill during recent years: South Tyrol. The Jews and the Habsburg legitimists have the greatest interest in obstructing an alliance policy with Germany, which in the future may lead to the resurrection of an independent German Fatherland. It is not affection for South Tyrol that caused the propaganda in its favor, because it has done that country more harm than good, but the fear of a possible understanding between Germany and Italy.

Yes. South Tyrol!

I wish to state that I was one of those who, at the time when the fate of South Tyrol was being decided – that is, from August 1914, to November 1918 – went where that country was being defended in practice – into the army. I fought throughout all that period, not in order that South Tyrol should be lost, but that it, as well as every other German country, should be preserved for the Fatherland. For South Tyrol was naturally not guaranteed to Germany by the lying and inflammatory speeches of smart parliamentarians on the Vienna Rathaus Square or before the Feldherrnhalle in Munich, but solely by the battalions at the fighting front. It was the people who broke up that front that betrayed South Tyrol, as well as all the other German districts.

It must be thoroughly understood that the lost lands will never be won back by solemn appeals to the good God, nor by pious hopes in any League of Nations, but only by force of arms.

This disgraceful part of it all is that the talkers themselves do not believe that anything is to be gained by their protests. They themselves know very well how harmless and hopeless their pottering ways are. They do it only because it is easier now to chatter about recovering South Tyrol, than at one time it was to fight for its retention. Each one does hit bit; we offered our blood for it, now these people sharpen their noses over it.

If the German nation is to stop the rot that threatens Europe, it must not fall into the errors of the pre-War period and make enemies of the Creator and the rest of the world, but it must ascertain who its most dangerous opponents are so as to strike at them with all its concentrated force. If Germany acts thus, the coming race will realize our great needs and anxieties, and admire our bitter determination the more, when they see the brilliant success that will result from it.

It was the fantastical idea of an alliance with the dead carcass of the Habsburg State that ruined Germany. Today, fantastic sentimentality in handling the possibilities of foreign policy is the best means for preventing our rising again for al time.

What did our governments do to infuse into this nation once again the spirit of proud independence, manly defiance, and indignant hatred?

In 1919, when the German nation was burdened with the Peace Treaty, there was justification in hoping that, that document of oppression would help on the cry for Germany's liberation. It happens sometimes that treaties of peace whose conditions beat upon a nation like scourges sound the first trumpet call for the resurrection that follows later.

How much might have been made out of the Treaty of Versailles? Each point of it might have been burnt into the brains and feelings of the nation, until finally the common shame and the common hatred would have become a sea of flaming fire in the minds of sixty millions of men and women; out of the glowing mass, a will of steel would have emerged, and a cry: We will be armed once more!

Every opportunity was missed and nothing was done. Who will wonder that our nation is not what it ought to be, and might be?

A nation – in a position such as ours – will not be considered fit for alliances unless Government and public opinion determine to cooperate in proclaiming and defending their will to fight for freedom.

The cry for a new war fleet, restoration of our colonies, etc., is obviously mere empty talk, since it contains no idea of practical possibility; calm consideration shows this at once. Those who protest, thus are exhausting themselves in harmful demonstrations against the Creator and the rest of the world, and they forget the first principle that is essential to all success: What thou doest, do thoroughly. By howling against five or ten States, we neglect to concentrate all of the forces of the national will and physique for a blow at the heart of our most

impassioned enemy, and we are sacrificing the possibility of acquiring strength by means of alliances for the final struggle. This is where there is a mission for the National Socialist movement. It must teach our people to pass over trifles and look towards what is great, not to split up on account of side-issues, and never to forget that the aim for which we have to fight today is the bare existence of our nation, and the one enemy at whom we have to strike is ever the force which is robbing us of that existence.

The German nation has, moreover, no moral right to complain of the attitude adopted by the rest of the world, until it has punished the criminals who sold and betrayed their own country.

It is conceivable that those who represent the true interests of the nations with whom an alliance is possible, will be able to carry their views against the will of the mortal enemy of free national States? Will, for instance, the forces of tradition of statesmanship in England break, or fail to break, the overpowering influence of Jewry? This is a very difficult question to answer. It depends upon too many factors for a final judgment to be pronounced on it.

The fight waged by Fascist Italy against the three main forces of Jewry – unconsciously, perhaps, though I personally do not believe that – is the best of proofs that the poison fangs of that power outside and above the State are being drawn, even though by indirect means. Secret societies are prohibited, the independent, super-national press is prosecuted, and international Marxism has been broken down.

It is all more difficult in England. There, the Jews almost entirely control 'free Democracy' by indirectly influencing public opinion. Yet, even in England, there is a continuous struggle going on between the representatives of British State interests and the Jewish world-dictatorship.

One saw after the War for the first time how closely these opposite forces impinged upon each other, in the attitude of British State leadership on the one hand, and of the press on the other, towards the problem of Japan. Directly the War was over; the old mutual irritation between America and Japan began to reappear. Ties of relationship could not prevent a certain feeling of jealous anxiety against the American Union growing up in every domain of international economics and politics. It is comprehensible that England should anxiously run through the list of her old alliances and see a moment arriving when the word would not be 'Great Britain overseas,' but 'The Ocean for America.'

It was not a British interest, but in the first place, a Jewish one, to destroy Germany, just as today the destruction of Japan would serve British State interests less than it would the far reaching wishes of the controller of the hoped for Jewish world empire. While England is exhausting herself in maintaining her position in the world, the Jew is organizing his measures for its conquest.

The Jew knows very well that after his thousand years of accommodation, he is able to undermine the peoples of Europe, and bring them up to be bastards without a race, but that he could hardly do the same to an Asiatic national State such as Japan.

Today, therefore, he is inciting the nations against Japan, as he once did against Germany, so that it may well happen that, while British statesmanship is trying to build on the Japanese alliance, the Jewish press in England may be at the same time calling for a fight against the ally, and preparing for a war of extermination by proclaiming Democracy, and raising the slogan: Down with Japanese Militarism and Imperialism.

Thus, the Jew is today, a rebel in England, and the struggle against the Jewish world menace will be started there also.

The National Socialist movement must see to it that, in our own country at least, the deadly enemy is realized, and that the fight against him may be a torch to illumine a less murky period for other nations as well, and may bring benefit to Aryan humanity in its struggle for life.

XIV

EASTERN POLICY

OUR so-called intelligentsia are beginning in a most unhealthy fashion to divert our foreign policy from any real representation of our national interests, in order that it may serve their fantastic theories, and I feel myself obliged to speak with special care to my adherents on a most important question of foreign policy, namely, our relations towards Russia, since it ought to be understood by all, and can be treated of in a work such as this.

The duty of a foreign policy of a national State, is to ensure the existence of the race included in that State by keeping a natural and healthy proportion between the numbers, and the increase of the nation, and the size and quality of the land in which they dwell.

Nothing but sufficient space on the earth ensures freedom of existence to a nation. In this way, only can the German nation defend itself as a world Power. For nearly two thousand years, our national interests, as our more or less happily conceived foreign activities may be termed, played their part in the world's history. We ourselves can witness to that. For the great struggle of the nations from 1914 to 1918, was but the German nation struggling for its existence in the world, and it went by the name of the World War.

At that time, the German nation was *ostensibly* a world Power. I say 'ostensibly' because it was not really a world Power. If the German nation had preserved the proportion I referred to above, German would really have been a world Power, and the War might, apart from all other factors, have ended in our favor.

Today Germany is not a world Power. From a purely territorial point of view, the area of the German Reich is insignificant compared with those of the so-called World Powers. England is not an example to be quoted, since the British Mother country is really but the great capital city of the British world Empire, which claims nearly a quarter of the earth's surface as its property. We must rather look at giant States, such as the American Union, then at China and Russia – enclosed areas, some of them ten times as big as the German Empire. France herself must be reckoned as one of their number. She is constantly adding to her army from the colored populations of her immense Empire. If France goes on as she is doing now for three hundred years, she will have a powerful enclosed territory from the Rhine to the Congo, filled with a race continually becoming more and more bastardized. That is where French colonial policy differs from Germany's former one.

Ours neither increased the lands occupied by the German race, nor did it make the criminal attempt to strengthen the Empire by introducing black blood. The Askari in German East Africa were a small, hesitating step in that direction, but actually they were only used for defense of the colony itself.

We have ceased to enjoy any position compared with the other great States of the world, and that thanks merely to the fatal direction of our nation in foreign

policy, to absolute lack of any tradition, as I might call it, of a definite policy in foreign affairs, and to loss of all sound instinct and urge to maintain ourselves as a nation.

All of this must be remedied by the National Socialist movement, which must attempt to remove the disproportion between our population and our area – the latter seen both as the source of nourishment and the basis of political power – between our historic past and the hopelessness of our present impotence.

One of the greatest achievements of German policy was the formation of the Prussian State, and the cultivation, through it, of the idea of a State; also the building up of the German army, brought up to date with modern requirements. The change from the idea of individual defense to national defense as a duty sprang directly from that State formation, and the new principle that it introduced. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of that event. The German nation disintegrated by excess of individualism, became disciplined under the Prussian army organism, and recovered by its means at least some of the capacity for organization, which had been lost. By the process of military training, we recovered for ourselves as a nation what other nations have always possessed in their pursuit of unity. Therefore, the abolition of the obligation of military service – which may have no point for dozens of other nations – is of fateful significance to us. Given ten generations of Germans without the discipline and education of military training and delivered over to the evil influences of the disunity which is in their blood, and our nation would have lost the last relics of independent existence on this planet. The German spirit would have made its contribution to civilization solely under the flags of foreign nations, and its origin would have been lost in oblivion.

It is highly important for our manner in proceeding both now and in the future that the real political successes of our nation, and the profitless objects for which the blood of our nation was spilt, should be clearly distinguished and kept apart. The National-Socialist movement must never join in with the vicious and noisy patriotism of our bourgeois world of today. It is especially dangerous for us to regard ourselves as being in the least bound by the developments just before the War. Our object must be to bring our territory into harmony with the numbers of our population.

The demand for restoration of the frontiers of 1914 is politically foolish. Yet, those who persist in it proclaim it as the object of their action in politics, and by so doing they tend to consolidate the hostile alliance, which would otherwise be falling apart in the natural course. This is the only explanation why, eight years after a world struggle in which States with heterogeneous desires and aims took part, the then victorious coalition manages to carry on in a more or less solid formation.

All those States profited at the time by Germany's collapse. Fear of our strength thrust the mutual envy and jealousy of the individual Great Powers into the background. They considered that, if our Empire could be divided up between

them, it would be the best guard against any future rising. An evil conscience and the fear of our nation's strength is the most effectual cement for binding the members of that alliance together.

Times have altered since the Conference of Vienna. Princes and their mistresses no longer gamble for provinces, but now the pitiless international Jew is fighting for control of the nations.

The frontiers of 1914 mean nothing in respect to Germany's future. They were no protection in the past, nor would they mean strength in the future. They would not give the German nation internal solidarity, nor would they provide it with nourishment; from a military standpoint, they would not be suitable or even satisfactory, nor would they improve our present situation with regard to the other world Powers, or rather, the Powers that are the real world Powers. The distance from England would not be shortened, nor would those frontiers make us as big as America; France, moreover, would not suffer any essential diminution of her importance in world politics.

Only one thing is certain. Any attempt to restore the frontiers of 1914, even if successful, would merely lead to a further pouring out of our nation's blood, until there were none worth mentioning for the decisions and actions, which are to remake the life and future of the nation. On the contrary, the vain glamour of that empty success would cause us to renounce any more distant objective, since 'national honor' would then be satisfied, and the door opened once again, anyhow until something else happened, for commercial enterprise. It is the duty of National Socialists to cling steadfastly to our aims in foreign policy, and these are to assure the German nation the territory, which it is due on this earth. This form of action is the only one that could justify bloodshed in the eyes of the Creator and of future generations in Germany.

No nation on earth holds a square yard of territory by any right derived from Heaven. Frontiers are made and altered by human agency alone. The fact that a nation succeeds in acquiring an unfair share of territory is no superior reason for its being respected forever. It merely proves the strength of the conqueror, and the weakness of those who lose by it. This strength alone constitutes the right to possess.

Therefore, just as our forefathers did not receive the land in which we live as a present from Heaven, but had to fight with their lives for it, so in future, nothing will grant us land and life for our nation, except the power of a victorious sword.

However much we recognize today the necessity of a settlement with France, it will be useless in the long run if our general objective in foreign policy is to be sacrificed for the sake of it. There can only be sense in it if it offers a backing for extending the space that our people are to inhabit in Europe. For acquisition of colonies will not solve that question – nothing, in fact, but the gain of territory for settlement which shall extend the area of the Mother country itself, and thus not only keep the new settlers in close communion with the land of their origin, but

guarantee to the combination all of the advantages arising from the size of the united whole.

We National Socialists have deliberately drawn a line through the pre-War tendency of our foreign policy. We are where they were six hundred years ago. We stem the Germanic stream towards the south and west of Europe, and turn our eyes eastwards. We have finished with the pre-War policy of colonies and trade, and are going over to the land policy of the future.

When we talk of new lands in Europe, we are bound to think first of Russia and her Border States.

Fate itself seems to wish to give us our direction. When fate abandoned Russia to Bolshevism, it robbed the Russian people of the educated class that once created and guaranteed their existence as a State. For the organized Russian State was not due to any political capacity in the Slav race, but it was a wonderful example of the efficiency of the Germanic element in forming States among inferior races. This Germanic element may now be regarded as entirely wiped out in Russia. The Jew has taken its place. It is impossible for the Russian to shake off the Jewish yoke by his own strength, as it is for the Jew to keep control of the vast empire for any length of time. His character is not that of an organizer, but of a decomposing leaven. The immense Empire is ripe for collapse; and the end of the Jewish domination will mean the end of Russia as a State.

Such a policy on our part is, of course, most violently opposed by the Jews. They invoke the spirit of Bismarck as an argument for a policy that is senseless and impossible, and also most harmful to the German nation. They say Bismarck set great store on preserving good relations with Russia. That is undoubtedly correct. But they entirely forget to mention that he also set much store on good relations with Italy, in fact, that Herr von Bismarck actually made an alliance with Italy in order to finish with Austria more easily. Why is that policy not continued? 'Because,' it will be said 'Italy now is not the Italy of those days.' Good. Then, sirs, allow me to remark that Russia today is no longer the Russia of those days. Bismarck was far too much master of the opportunity of the moment to allow himself to be tied down in that way. Thus, the question should be, not, 'What would Bismarck have done then?' but, 'What would he do now?' It is also easier to answer. His political skill would never have prompted him to ally himself with a State, which is doomed to collapse.

Moreover, Bismarck regarded the policy of colonies and trade with very mixed feelings in his time, for his concern was in consolidating, and establishing by the safest methods, the State which he had created. That was his sole reason for welcoming the Russian 're-insurance,' since it left his hands free towards the West. But that which was useful to Germany then would only do harm to her now.

As early as 1920-21, the party was approached from various quarters in an attempt to bring it into touch with liberationist movements in other countries. It was on the lines of the much advertized 'Association of Oppressed nations.' They consisted chiefly of representatives of certain Balkan States, also some from

Egypt and India, who impressed me as being chattering busybodies, with nothing behind them. But there were quite a few Germans, especially among the Nationalists, who let themselves be taken in by those jabbering Orientals, and imagined that any Indian or Egyptian student who happened to turn up, was a genuine 'representative' of India or Egypt. They never troubled to inquire, nor did they realize, that these were people with nothing behind them, and without authority from anyone to conclude any sort of agreement; so that the result of dealing with such characters was just nil and mere waste of time.

I will remember the childish and incomprehensible hopes, which arose suddenly in 1920-21 in Nationalist circles. England was supposed to be on the verge of collapse in India. A few mountebanks from Asia (they may have been genuine fighters for freedom in India, for all I care) who ran round Europe had managed to inspire quite reasonable people with the fixed idea that the British world Empire, with its pivot in India, was just about to collapse there. That the wish was father to the thought never occurred to them.

It is childish to assume that in England, the importance of the Indian Empire for the British world union is not appreciated. And it is a sad proof of the refusal to take a lesson from the World War, and to realize the determination of the Anglo-Saxon character, when people imagine that England would let India go. It also proves the complete ignorance prevailing in Germany as to the methods by which the British administer that Empire. England will never lose India unless she gives way to racial confusion in her machinery of administration, or unless she is forced to do so by the sword of a powerful enemy. Indian risings will never be successful. We Germans know well enough by experience how hard it is to force England's hand. Apart from all of this, I, speaking as a German, would far rather see India under British domination, than that of any other nation.

The hopes of a mythical rising in Egypt against British influence were equally ill founded.

It was bad enough in times of peace. The alliances with Austria and Turkey were nothing to rejoice over. At a moment when the greatest military and industrial States in the world were joining together in an active offensive alliance, we collected a couple of weak, out-of-date States, and attempted with the aid of a mass of lumber, fated to go under, to face an active world coalition. Germany paid heavily for this error in foreign policy.

As a Nationalist, estimating humanity by the principle of race, I cannot admit that it is right to chain the fortunes of one's nation to the so-called 'oppressed nationalities' since I know how worthless they are racially.

The present day rulers of Russia have no intention of entering into an alliance honorably, or of sticking to one. We must not forget that they are low blood-stained criminals, that it means dealing with the scum of humanity, and that, favored by circumstances in a tragic hour, they overran a great State, and in a fury of massacre, wiped out millions of their most intelligent fellow countrymen, and now for ten years, they have been conducting the most tyrannous régime of all time. We must not forget that those rulers belong to a nation that combines a

rare mixture of bestial cruelty and vast skill in lies, and considers itself specially called now to gather the whole world under its bloody oppression. We must not forget that the international Jew, who continues to dominate over Russia, does not regard Germany as an ally, but as a State destined to undergo a similar fate.

The menace that Russia suffered under, is one which perpetually hangs over Germany. Germany is the next great objective of Bolshevism. All the strength of a young missionary idea, is needed to raise up our nation once more, rescue it from the embrace of the international python, and stem the corruption of its blood at home, so that the forces of the nation, once set free, may be employed in preserving our nationality. If this is our aim, it is folly to become allied with a Power whose master is the deadly enemy of our future.

Our special error, which the old German Empire committed with respect to its policy of alliances, was that it spoiled its relations towards all by continually swinging this way and that, and by its weakness in preserving peace at all costs. One thing only it cannot be reproached with; it did not continue to maintain its good relations with Russia.

I admit frankly that before the War, I thought it would have been better if Germany had renounced her foolish colonial policy, and her naval policy, had joined England in alliance with Russia, and had abandoned her weak aspiration to cover the entire world for a determined policy of acquiring territory on the Continent of Europe.

I do not forget the perpetual insolent threats offered Germany by Pan-Slavist Russia; I do not forget the continual practice mobilizations, the sole object of which was to annoy Germany; I cannot forget the temper of public opinion in Russia, which before the War, excelled itself in hate-inspired attacks on our nation and Empire, nor can I forget the great Russian press, which was always more in favor of France than of us.

Nevertheless, there was still another way before the War; we might have learned in the direction of Russia, with the idea of turning her against England.

The present consolidation of the Great Powers is the last warning signal to us to take thought, bring our people back from their dreamland to the hard truth, and show the way by which alone the old Reich may blossom forth once again.

If the National-Socialist movement shakes off all illusions and takes reason as its sole leader, the catastrophe of 1918 may turn out to be an immense blessing for the future of our nation. We may end by gaining what England possesses, what even Russia possessed, and what France time and again used in making correct decisions for her own interest: a Political Tradition.

For Germany, the course to be adopted is clear. She must never allow two Continental Powers to arise in Europe. She must regard any attempt to organize a military Power on her frontiers, even though merely in the form of a State capable of becoming military, as an aggression against Germany, and must consider it not only a right, but a duty to prevent it by every means, even to the extent of taking up arms.

The military results of an alliance with England and Italy would be directly opposite to those of one with Russia. The most important one is the fact that a *rapprochement* with those two countries would not at all mean a risk of war. The only Power that might assume an attitude in opposition to such an alliance – France – would not be in a position to do so. Thus, that alliance would make Germany able to make the preparations in peace and quiet, which, within the bounds of such a coalition, would have to be taken for a settlement with France. For it would automatically break up the Entente which caused Germany so much unhappiness and isolate France, the deadly enemy of our nation. The new Anglo-German-Italian Alliance would hold the reins and France would cease to do so.

Almost equally important would be the fact that the new Alliance includes States that possess technical qualities that mutually supplement each other. Germany would at last acquire allies, which would not suck her blood like leeches, but which could and would do their part in supplementing our technical armaments.

There would, of course, be difficulties, as I stated in the previous chapter, in bringing about such an alliance. But was the making of the Entente any less difficult? Where King Edward was successful against interests, which were by nature mutually opposed, we shall and must succeed if the knowledge of the necessity of some development inspires us to concert our action with skill and ripe consideration.

We shall of course come up against the spiteful yappings of enemies of our race at home. We National Socialists must realize this, if we proclaim what our inward conviction tells us is absolutely essential. We must harden ourselves to face public opinion, driven crazy by Jewish cunning and exploiting our German lack of thought. Today we are but a rock in the river; in a few years, Fate may erect us as a dam, against which the general stream may be broken, only to flow forward in the new bed.

XV

EMERGENCY DEFENSE AS A RIGHT

WHEN we laid down our aims in November 1918, a policy was entered upon which in all human probability, was bound to lead to utter ruin. It becomes comprehensible how a period of time, which was sufficient between 1806 and 1813 to fill Prussia, utterly defeated though she was, with new energy and fighting spirit, was allowed to go by without being made use of, and, in fact, led to ever further weakening of our State. The reason for it was that, after the shameful Armistice was signed, no one had either energy or courage to oppose measures of oppression in which the enemy was repeatedly bringing out. He was too clever to demand too much at any one time.

Orders for disarmament, making us politically helpless, and economic plunderings followed one after another with the idea of producing the spirit which could regard General Dawes's mediation as a piece of luck, and the Locarno Treaty as a triumph.

By the winter of 1922-23, it was realized by all that, even after the conclusion of peace, France was working with iron determination to achieve her original war aims. For no one will believe that in the course of the four years of the most decisive struggle in her history, France shed the not too rich blood of her people, simply in order later on to receive compensation through reparations for the losses she would sustain. Alsace-Lorraine by itself would not explain the energy of the French War leaders if it were not already part of France's great political program of the future. That program is as follows: disintegration of Germany into a collection of small States. That was what chauvinistic France fought for, and in doing so, she was selling her nation to the vassals in truth of the international world Jew.

Germany did indeed collapse in lightning suddenness in November 1918. But, while the catastrophe was happening at home, the armies were still deep in the enemy countries. France's first concern was at that time, not the disintegration of Germany, but rather how to get the German armies as quickly as possible out of France and Belgium. Thus, the first attack of the leaders in Paris in finishing up the War was to disarm the German armies, and force them back into Germany. If possible, not until that was accomplished could they devote attention to attaining their own original War aim. For England, the War was really won when Germany was destroyed as a colonial and commercial Power, and was reduced to becoming a State of secondary importance. She had no interest in blotting out the German State altogether; in fact, she had ever reason to desire a future rival against France in Europe. Thus, France had to wait for peace before setting out on the work for which the War had laid the foundation, and Clemenceau's declaration that for him the Peace was merely a continuation of the War acquired additional significance.

France's intentions must have been known by the winter of 1922-23. I am convinced that the only way to alter those intentions in respect to ourselves will be to force the helm of the ship of our Reich round the turn the ram against the enemy, and I believe that there will be a good chance of success if we manage first to isolate France, so that the second struggle shall not be one of Germany against the world, but a defense of Germany against France, who is disturbing her peace and that of the world also.

So long as the eternal conflict between Germany and France consists merely of defense against French aggression, it will never come to a decision, but century after century, Germany will be driven from one position after another.

Not until this is fully understood in Germany, so that the German nation's will to live is no longer wasted in passive defense, but is gathered together for a final settlement with France, shall we be able to bring the eternal and fruitless struggle with that country to a decision.

In December 1922, the situation between Germany and France appeared to have become threatening again. France was contemplating vast new measures of oppression and needed sanctions for her action. It was hoped in France that, by occupying the Ruhr, she would finally break Germany's backbone and bring us into a desperate economic position in which we should be forced to assume very heavy obligations.

By the occupation of the Ruhr, Fate once more offered the German nation a chance of asserting itself; for what at first glance seemed to be a terrible misfortune contained on closer observation extremely promising possibilities of ending the sufferings of Germany. For the first time, France had truly and deeply estranged England – not merely the British diplomats who had concluded the French alliance, had maintained, and regarded it with cautious vision of cool calculation, but large sections of the nation as well. The business world in particular felt with scarcely concealed irritation this immense further strengthening of France's power on the Continent. Her occupation of the Ruhr coalfield deprived England of all the successes she had gained in the War, and it was Marshal Foch, and France, which he represented, and not the alert and painstaking diplomacy of England, which now were the victors.

Feeling in Italy also turned against France. Indeed, directly the War ended that friendship ceased to be exactly rosy, and now turned it into absolute hatred. The moment had come when the allies of yesterday might have become the foes of tomorrow. That this was not brought about was due mainly to the fact that Germany had no Enver Pasha, but merely a Cuno, for Chancellor.

In the spring of 1923, however, before the French occupation of the Ruhr could have been used as a pretext for rebuilding our military power, a new spirit would have had to be implanted in the German nation, its will power strengthened, and the corruptors of that greatest of forces in a nation would have had to be destroyed.

Just as the bloodshed of 1918 was a retribution for neglect in 1914 and 1915 to crush the Marxist menace underfoot, so was there bound to be a terrible punishment in the spring of 1923 for failing to seize the opportunity that was offered for finally destroying the handiwork of the Marxist traitors and murderers of the nation. Only bourgeois minds could have arrived at the incredible conception that Marxism could possibly now be other than it had been, and that the *canaille*, who had led in 1918, and who then without a qualm, used two million dead as steps up to seats in the Government, would now be ready to pay service to the nation's sense of right. It was incredible folly to expect that those traitors would suddenly turn into fighters for Germany's liberation. They were not dreaming of doing so! A Marxist is as little likely to turn from treason as a hyena will turn from carrion!

The situation in 1923 was very similar to that of 1918. The first essential to whatever form of resistance was decided upon was expulsion of the Marxist poison from the body of our nation. I was convinced that the very first duty of any truly National Government, was to seek and find forces determined on a war to destroy Marxism, and to grant those forces a free hand; it was their duty not to pay court to the folly of 'order and tranquility' at a moment when the foreign enemy was giving the death-blow to the Fatherland, and when at home, treason was lurking at every street corner. No, a truly National Government ought to have wished for unrest and disorder if the resulting confusion was the only method for a final settlement with the Marxist enemies of our nation.

I have frequently implored the so-called Nationalist parties to give Fate a free hand and allow our movement the means to come to a reckoning with Marxism; but I preached to deaf ears. They all thought they knew better, including the Chief of the Defense Force, until finally they found themselves face to face with the most miserable capitulation of all time. I then realized deep within myself that the German bourgeoisie had come to the end of its mission, and could be called upon to perform no further task.

At that period – I confess it frankly – I conceived a fervent admiration for the great man south of the Alps whose deep love for his nation forbade him to bargain with Italy's domestic enemies and who fought to destroy them by every possible means and method. The quality that ranks Mussolini with the world's great men, is his determination not to share Italy with Marxism, but to save his country by giving Internationalism over to destruction. How dwarfish our sham statesmen in Germany appear in comparison with him!

The attitude adopted by our bourgeoisie, and the way they spared Marxism, decided the fate of any attempt at active resistance in the Ruhr from the start. It was folly to try to fight France with that deadly enemy in our midst.

Even in the spring of 1923, it was easy to predict what would happen. It is useless to discuss whether there was, or was not a chance of a military success against France. For if the result of German action in the matter of the Ruhr had

been merely destruction of Marxism in Germany, the success would have been on our side.

Germany, once freed from the deadly enemies of her life and future, would possess a force, which no world could ever against strangle. On the day when Marxism is broken in Germany, its bonds are broken in good truth. For never in our history have we been conquered by the forces of our enemies, but rather by our own depravity, and by the enemy in our own camp.

However, in a great moment of inspiration, Heaven made Germany a present of a great man, Herr Cuno, whose method of reasoning was as follows: 'France is occupying the Ruhr; what is there, there? Coal. Is France occupying the Ruhr for the sake of its coal?' What could occur more obviously to Herr Cuno than a notion that a strike would deprive the French of the coal, and that they would then sooner or later clear out of the Ruhr, since the enterprise was not proving paying one? That was the train of thought of that 'outstanding' 'national' 'statesman.'

For a strike, they actually needed the Marxists, for it concerned the workers in the first place. So it was essential to bring the worker (in the brain of a bourgeoisie statesman such as Cuno- he is synonymous with the Marxist) into line with all the other Germans on the united front. The Marxists quickly came in with the idea; for the Marxists leaders needed Cuno's money, just as much as Cuno required them for his 'untitled front.'

If herr Cuno at that moment, instead of encouraging a purchased general strike, and making it the basis of his 'united front,' had demanded two hours more work from every German, the swindle of the 'united front,' would have been disposed of in three days. Nations do not achieve liberty by doing nothing, but by sacrifice. This so-called passive resistance could never have been kept up for any length of time. No one but a man who knew nothing about the was could imagine he could drive out an army of occupation by methods so absurd.

If the Westphalians in the Ruhr had been conscious of an army of eighty or a hundred divisions ready to support them, the French would have been treading on thorns.

As soon as the trades unions had practically filled up their moneyboxes out of Cuno's contributions, and it was nearly decided to change slack, passive resistance into active attack, the Red hyenas all at once broke away from the national sheepfold and returned to being what they always had been. Without a murmur, Herr Cuno retired on his board ships, and Germany became richer by one experience and poorer by one great hope.

But when the wretched collapse began and the shameful capitulation took place, after a sacrifice of milliards of money, and many thousands of young Germans who had been so simple as to trust the promises of the rulers of the Reich, indignation against such betrayal of our unhappy country burst forth in a blaze. In millions of people, the conviction shone forth that nothing but a radical purging of the entire system prevailing in Germany would bring salvation.

In this book, I can merely repeat the last sentence of my speech, and the great Trial of the spring of 1924: 'Though the judges of this State may be happy in their condemnation of our actions, yet history, the goddess of a higher truth and of a better law, will smile as she tears up this judgment, and will declare all of us innocent of blame and the duty of expiation.

I shall not attempt to describe here the attempts that led to and decided those of November 1923; because I do not think it will be of any profit for the future, and because there is really no point in tearing open wounds that are still hardly scabbed over, or of talking of guilt in the case of persons, who all perhaps clung to their nation with equal love in the depths of their hearts, but merely missed the common road or failed to agree together regarding it.

THE END